

TRANSLATIONS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE—SERIES VI

ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS  
OF THE GOSPELS

BY  
HAROLD SMITH, D.D.

VOLUME II

LONDON  
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING  
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE  
NEW YORK AND TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO.

1926

**The substance of a Thesis approved by  
the University of London for the degree  
of D.D., and aided by a grant from  
their Publication Fund.**

**PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY  
BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER**



## PREFACE

THE origin, scope and plan of this work are described in the preface to Vol. I. I add here simply three points calling for explanation:

1. This work is slightly compressed from a thesis for which the degree of D.D. was awarded by the University of London in 1918 ; hence it takes no account of investigations or editions since that date.

2. I have claimed the liberty taken by all catenists of occasionally compressing my originals, without always marking such compression or omission. My renderings are usually close enough, but sometimes free.

3. I have included only passages with a clear reference to the Gospels ; thus, not all passages speaking of the Logos, but only those referring to St. John's Prologue ; not all dealing with the Eucharist, but only where its Institution is clearly mentioned ; not all treating of Divorce, but only where the Lord's teaching is distinctly in view. My aim is completeness of Exegesis, not of Doctrine.



# CONTENTS

**PAGE**

TRANSLATION—

XIX.	JOHN i. 35-42	...	...	1
XX.	JOHN i. 43-51	...	...	3
XXI.	JOHN ii. 1-12	...	...	6
XXII.	JOHN ii. 13-25	...	...	14
XXIII.	JOHN iii. 1-21	...	...	32
XXIV.	JOHN iii. 22-36	...	...	50
XXV.	A. LUKE iii. 19-20 ; MATT. xiv. 3-5 ; MARK vi. 17-20	...	...	59
	B. MATT. iv. 12 ; MARK i. 14 ; LUKE iv. 14 ; JOHN iv. 1-3	...	...	60
XXVI.	JOHN iv. 4-42	...	...	62
XXVII.	JOHN iv. 43-54	...	...	117
XXVIII.	JOHN v. 1-47	...	...	129
XXIX.	A. MATT. iv. (12) 17 ; MARK i. (14) 15 ; LUKE iv. (14) 15	...	...	141
	B. LUKE iv. 16-30	...	...	142
XXX.	MATT. iv. 13-16 ; LUKE iv. 31	...	...	146
XXXI.	MARK i. 16-20 ; MATT. iv. 18-22 ; LUKE v. 1-11	...	...	147
XXXII.	MARK i. 21-28 ; LUKE iv. 31-38	...	...	150
XXXIII.	MATT. viii. 14-17 ; MARK i. 29-34 ; LUKE iv. 38-41	...	...	152
XXXIV.	MARK i. 35-39 ; LUKE iv. 42-44	...	...	153
	MATT. iv. 23	...	...	153

	PAGE
TRANSLATION—( <i>continued</i> )	
XXXV. MATT. viii. 1-4; MARK i. 40-45; LUKE v. 12-16 ...	153
XXXVI. MATT. ix. 1-8; MARK ii. 1-12; LUKE v. 17-26 ...	156
XXXVII. MATT. ix. 9-13, 14-17; MARK ii. 13-17, 18-22; LUKE v. 27-32, 33-39 ...	159
XXXVIII. MATT. xii. 1-8; MARK ii. 23-28; LUKE vi. 1-5 ...	168
XXXIX. A. MATT. xii. 9-14; MARK iii. 1-6; LUKE vi. 6-11 ...	172
B. MATT. xii. 15-21 ...	174
XL. A. MATT. x. 2-4; MARK iii. 13-19; LUKE vi. 12-16 ...	175
B. MATT. iv. 24-25; MARK iii. 7-12; LUKE vi. 17-19 ...	178
XLI. MATT. v. 1-vii. 29; WITH PARALLELS IN LUKE ...	179
XLII. MATT. viii. 5-13; LUKE vii. 1-10 ...	311
XLIII. LUKE vii. 11-17 ...	314
XLIV. MATT. xi. 2-6; LUKE vii. 18-23 ...	314
MATT. xi. 7-19; LUKE vii. 24-35 ...	314
XLV. LUKE vii. 36-50 ...	327
XLVI. LUKE viii. 1-3 ...	332
XLVII. MATT. xii. 22-37; MARK iii. 19-30; LUKE xi. 17-23; vi. 43-5 ...	332
XLVIII. MATT. xii. 46-50; MARK iii. 31-5; LUKE viii. 19-21 ...	344

## XIX

### JOHN i. 35-42

v. 36. **Clement**, Paed, I. v. 24. Since Scripture gives the name of 'Lambs' to infant children, God the Word who became man for us, wishing to be made like to us in all things, has been called the Lamb of God—the Son of God, the Infant of the Father.

v. 38. **Origen**, Matthew, Tome xii. 22, p. 541. 'Turning' is never said superfluously. Jesus turning and seeing them, viz. Peter and Andrew, following, says to them 'What seek ye?' The *turning* was to benefit those to whom He turned.

John, Tome ii. 36, p. 90. Perhaps it is not without meaning that John stops with six testimonies, but Jesus at the seventh prefixes 'What seek ye?'. Suitable for those profited by John's testimonies is the voice declaring Christ a teacher, and avowing a longing to behold the dwelling place of the Son of God; for they say to Him, 'Rabbi', which by interpretation means 'Teacher', 'where dwellest thou?' And since every one who seeks finds, Jesus shows His dwelling to John's disciples who have sought it, saying to them 'Come and ye shall see'; perhaps by 'Come' inviting them to action, and by 'ye shall see' suggesting that there will certainly be contemplation following the accomplishment of actions for those who wish it; this takes place in Jesus' dwelling. It was open to those who sought where Jesus dwelt, following their Teacher and seeing, to continue with Jesus and to spend that day with the Son of God. (There is some mystical

LIBRARY OF

— CORNELL UNIVERSITY DIVINITY SCHOOL

meaning in 'the tenth hour'.) One of them was Andrew, brother of Simon Peter; he, profited by having stayed with Jesus, finding his own brother Simon, for perhaps he had not been previously found, says that they have found the Messiah, the Christ. For since he who seeks finds, and he sought where Jesus dwells, and following and beholding His dwelling, abides with the Lord in the tenth hour and beholds the Son of God, the Word and Wisdom, and is reigned over by Him as King; he therefore says 'We have found the Messiah.' This speech might be said by any one who has found this Word of God, and been ruled by His divinity. But he forthwith brings to Christ as fruit his brother Simon; on him Jesus deigned to look, i.e. through looking on him to visit and enlighten his mind; <sup>1</sup> and because of Jesus having looked upon him Simon has been able to be established, so as to receive a name from his work of steadfastness and solidity, and to be called 'Peter' (Rock).

X. 8 (6), p. 167. Perhaps in conception <sup>2</sup> the Simon who is found by his own brother Andrew and told 'Thou shalt be called Kephas' is distinct from him who was seen along with his brother by Jesus walking by the Sea of Galilee, and told along with that Andrew 'Come after me and I will make you fishers of men'. . .

Frag. 21. It is worth while to examine how now Andrew on the second day from Jesus' baptism straightway finds his own brother Peter; but elsewhere Jesus many days after His baptism finds Peter and Andrew his brother, according to Matthew. It is then probable that Andrew at first, having brought Peter to Jesus, received a slight benefit from His Teacher; then, after

<sup>1</sup> ἡνεμονικόν.

<sup>2</sup> ἐπινοία.



his brother had received benefit, he had withdrawn to rest at their home ; but that Jesus, after the former call, has called them to follow Him continuously, with power to fish men through the teaching He bestowed on them. He says ' Come and see ', perhaps by ' Come ' calling them to action, but by ' see ' suggesting that there will certainly be contemplation following. . . . (Cp. II. 36, above).

Frag. 22. He said that he would be called Peter, taking his name from the Rock <sup>1</sup> which is Christ ; that as a wise man comes from wisdom and a holy man from holiness, so also Peter from the Rock. This is shown by what the Saviour said to him who was so named—' Thou art Peter, and on this Rock I will build my Church.'

## XX

## JOHN i. 43-51

Origen, John, Frag. 23. ' He was minded ' is ambiguous, the subject may be *Andrew*, or *Jesus*. It appears rather to refer to Andrew, who went forth into Galilee and found Philip. To this Philip, found by Andrew, Jesus says ' Follow me '. To follow Jesus is to follow the Word, Wisdom, and Righteousness, doing and thinking rightly.

Bethsaida is interpreted in Greek ' House of Hunters ' <sup>2</sup> to whom Jesus said ' Come after me and I will make you fishers of men '. See Jer. xvi. 16.

v. 45. Frag. 24. He does not mean that the prophets wrote thus, that Jesus would be the son of Joseph, from Nazareth, but meant ' The son of Joseph from

<sup>1</sup> πέτρα.

<sup>2</sup> θηρευτῶν.

Nazareth, him have we found, being the one of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, spoke.'

Romans, Book IV. 8, p. 537. Enlightened by the Law and the Prophets, they had beheld the light of the glory as of Only Begotten from Father.

v. 46. John, Frag. 25. He says either 'From Nazareth can any good thing be?' in doubt whether so great a good can be from Nazareth; or else he says confidently, 'From Nazareth indeed is He who was found, and it is truly good.' To him says Philip 'Come and see Jesus who is found', wanting to assure him of Him who was found, rather by sight than by hearing.

v. 49. Frag. 26. Nathanael says to Jesus, 'Thou art the Son of God; Thou art King of Israel, the clear-sighted race.'<sup>1</sup> For to see the heart, and to know who has guile in himself and who has not belongs to a Son of God, not one out of many sons, but the Only-Begotten who is King of the chosen race. But Jesus is this, being therefore also Son of God.

v. 50. Frag. 27. 'Thou sawest me then, when I was under the fig-tree, before I was called by Philip?' Philip from following Jesus the Word of God and Wisdom of God, has become a hunter of the souls given by God to those who can help them. For 'Nathanael' is interpreted 'Gift of God.' To this disciple given him he does not straightway impart about the Godhead of the Son of God, but about his incarnate life, saying 'Him whom all we Hebrews alike read of as coming, in the writings of Moses and the prophets, we have found;—Jesus, who was born of the Virgin without seed of man, who is called son of Joseph who was espoused to Mary; having his birth locally from

<sup>1</sup> τὸ διορατικὸν γένος.



Nazareth, for Nazareth is the city of the Virgin.' The disciple Nathanael accepting this from Philip, who has now become his teacher, says to him, 'If what is found is from Nazareth, is it good?' Philip straightway calling him to see the thing with his own eyes, says to him, 'Come and see,' not wanting the disciple to be always a hearer of words, but to be a beholder<sup>1</sup> of the truth, hastening to behold after hearing the words. Jesus seeing Nathanael not only walking, but also coming by way of advance even to behold, bears witness to him who is so eager to understand the truth; He says to those present, 'See ye this man coming? He is an Israelite not only literally,<sup>2</sup> and according to the flesh, but also according to spirit and thought. For he has a mind which beholds (contemplates) God; for he is truly an Israelite, not falsely so called, since he is clear from all guile, a friend of truth.'

v. 51. Prayer, xi. 3, p. 214. Not idly do the angels of God ascend and descend on the Son of Man, seen by the eyes enlightened with the light of knowledge.

Ezekiel, Hom. xiii. 2, p. 402. A multitude daily descends and ascends on the Son of Man.

John, Frag. 120 (Preuschen). It is not possible to see with the senses, but only with the mind, the angels coming to minister to Jesus ascending and descending. 'Amen' is sometimes found singly, sometimes doubled. It is a Hebrew word, meaning 'So be it.'<sup>3</sup> Many Psalms have at their close *γένοιτο, γένοιτο*, 'be it so', in Hebrew 'Amen, Amen.' It is then probable that the Saviour in prayer said 'Be it so'—that you may be found faithful so as to see the heaven opened, and what follows. But 'Amen' is also the same as 'truly', as

<sup>1</sup> θεωρόν.

<sup>2</sup> αἰσθητῶς.

<sup>3</sup> γένοιτο.

in Matthew, 'Amen, I say to you there are some of those standing here'—and in the parallel in Luke. Thus 'Amen' is the equivalent of 'So be it' and of 'truly'.

v. 49. **Irenæus**, III. xi. 9, H.; III. xi. 6, p. 189, M.  
The Israelite knew his King.

## XXI

## JOHN ii. 1-12

1f. **Clement**, Paed. II. ii. 29. For although He made the water into wine at the marriage, He did not allow men to be drunken, but gave life to the wateriness<sup>1</sup> of the understanding. . . . He has filled the whole world with the blood of the vine, furnishing the drink of the truth, the mixture of the old Law and the new Word. . . .

**Tertullian**, Single Marriage, 8. This 'glutton and winebibber', frequenter of dinners and suppers with publicans and sinners, sups once at one marriage out of many. For He meant to celebrate these as often as He meant them to be ('totiens enim voluit celebrare eas quotiens et esse').

**Epiphanius**, Haer. li. 4, p. 424; and 18, p. 441. The *Alogi* say that the Gospel in the name of John is false, by omitting a good deal found in the rest. For after saying that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and a few other things, it straightway says 'There was a marriage in Cana of Galilee.'

**Cyprian**, Ep. 63, 12 ('Against the Aquarians'). How perverse and contrary it is, whereas the Lord at the marriage made wine out of water, for us to make water out of wine. . . . Christ, teaching and showing that the people of the Gentiles succeed and that we hereafter by merit of faith come into the place which the Jews had

<sup>1</sup> ὑδαρές.

lost, made wine out of water, that is, showed that to the marriage of Christ and the Church a greater multitude of nations should flow and come together on the failure of the Jews.

**Origen**, John, Tome vi. 49 (30), p. 150. The third day from i. 43, the sixth in the series from the beginning (i. 19-28).

**Frag. 28.** The third day being now come from Jesus' Baptism, on a marriage taking place in Cana of Galilee, and Jesus' Mother being there, on the failure of the wine He made wine out of water. . . . Jesus being Maker of man and woman does not refuse to be called to a marriage ; it was He who after forming Eve brought her to Adam. Therefore in the Gospel He says about association,<sup>1</sup> ' What God hath joined together let not man put asunder.' Let the heretics therefore be put to shame who reject marriage, since Jesus was called to a marriage and His Mother was there.

**Frag. 74** (on x. 30). One of these good works was the sign at Cana, when the first wine failed, because ' The Law and the Prophets were until John ' ; we with whom Jesus sits at meat have abounded with good wine. And this is the beginning of His signs, in the calling of the people from the Gentiles ; since it is written, ' This (as) the beginning of His signs did Jesus.'

**v. 3f. Irenæus**, III. xi. 9, H. ; III. xi. 5, p. 189, M. Good was also the wine which by creation was made by God in the vineyard, and was drunk at the first. For none of those who drank it found fault with it ; yea even the Lord took of it. But better was the wine which was made through the Word concisely and simply out of water for the use of those assembled to the marriage. For although the Lord could, without taking

<sup>1</sup> *σύνοδον*.



as His basis and material anything of the creation, furnish wine to the feasters and satisfy the hungry with food, this He did not do ; but taking the loaves which were from the earth, and giving thanks, and again making water wine, he satisfied those who were sitting down, and gave drink to those invited to the marriage ; showing that God who made the earth and bade it bear fruits, and settled the waters and brought forth springs, He also in the last times gives to mankind through His Son the blessing of food and the grace of drink.

III. xvii. 7, H. ; III. xvi. 7, p. 206, M. When Mary was hurrying to this wondrous sign of the wine, and wanted before the time to share in the cup made immediately,<sup>1</sup> the Lord repelling her untimely haste, said ' Woman, what have I to do with thee ? Mine hour is not yet come,' awaiting the hour foreknown by the Father. (All our Lord did was in due time and order).

**Hippolytus**, Heresies, vii. 15 (27). *Basilides*. That each thing has its own times, the Saviour is sufficient authority, saying ' My hour is not yet come.'

**Monarchian Prologue** (T. U. XV). John sets down the first sign which God did at the marriage ; that, displaying what He was, he might prove to his readers that where the Lord is invited the wine of marriage ought to fail, and that all things instituted by Christ may appear in newness, the old being changed.

(**Hippolytus**) Lazarus. Why did He say ' Fill the pots with water ? ' Could not He who had through a word created the heaven and established the earth and all things in it, Himself fill the pots ? But He said ' Fill them with water ' ; why ? that if any should deny the fact, the hands of those who had filled the water and the

<sup>1</sup> compendii poculo.

shoulders of those who had carried it might be able to convict them of falsehood.

v. 4. Origen, Psalm cxliv (cxlv) 15. (Pitra iii. 356.) He meant that the hour for signs was not yet come, since signs are not for those who believe but for the unbelievers; for unbelief is wont to come after the preaching, but the Lord had not yet begun to preach the kingdom of heaven.

Matthew, §. 97, p. 905—on Matt. xxvi. 45. On account of this hour He said to His Mother, ' Mine hour is not yet come.'

First Principles, IV. ii. 5 (12), p. 169 (Philocalia, i. 12). Some Scriptures have nothing corporeal, so that we ought sometimes to seek only for the soul and spirit of the Scripture. Perhaps for this reason the waterpots said to be set for the purifying of the Jews, as we have read in the Gospel according to John, hold two or three firkins apiece; the Word hints darkly of the invisible Jews of Rom. ii. 29, that they are cleansed through the word of the Scriptures, which sometimes contain two firkins, the word so to speak of soul and of spirit,<sup>1</sup> sometimes three, since some have in addition to the aforesaid also the bodily element capable of edifying. The six waterpots are naturally for those cleansed in the world, which was made in six days as a complete number.

John, Frag. 29. See the carefulness of the evangelist. He introduces Jesus charging not His own disciples, but the servants of the feast, about drawing the water; if Jesus' disciples had drawn it, calumniators might have said ' They filled the waterpots with wine while pretending to have filled them with water.'

<sup>1</sup> ψυχικόν καὶ πνευματικόν.

Connected with this is also 'They filled the waterpots up to the brim'; and in order to leave no pretext for cavilling as though wine were added without the pots having been filled with water, He thought fit that it should be recognized that the whole had been made from water. (Text corrupt.)

John, Tome xiii. 62 (60), pp. 277-8 (See § xxvii. on John iv. 54.)

Frag. 30. 'Believed' is equivalent to 'were settled'; for he speaks of faith for the most part rather in connection with its settlement. To them also He manifested His glory the more; for it is the work of a Creator, not a creature, to change substance. For, for wine to be made from water is a change not merely of quality but of substance.

Hippolytus, Heresies, v. 3 (8). *Naassenes*.

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, ix. 8, p. 439. Eusebius sees a prophecy of this first miracle, done in Galilee, in Isa. ix. 1-2. (LXX. τοῦτο πρῶτον πίε, ταχὺ ποίει, 'This drink first, make speedy, land of Zebulon and land of Naphtali, Galilee of the Gentiles'). But the miracle was a token of a more mystic mixture<sup>1</sup> changed from the more material to the intellectual and spiritual gladness of the genuine<sup>2</sup> mixture of the new Covenant.

So, On Isa. ix. 1.

Athanasius, Incarnation, 18. Who seeing the change of the nature<sup>3</sup> of water, and its translation into wine, does not understand that the Lord who wrought this is also Creator of the nature of all waters?

v. 12. Origen. John, Tome x. 1f, p. 160. (Origen compares the order of events in the other Gospels,

<sup>1</sup> κράμα.

<sup>2</sup> πιστικός.

<sup>3</sup> οὐσίαν.



finding insuperable difficulties in reconciling it, taken literally, with the order in this.)

The Three say that after the Lord's conflict with the devil He withdrew into Galilee. Matthew and Luke say that having previously been at Nazareth He afterwards left it and came and settled at Capernaum. Matthew and Mark give a reason for his withdrawal—His having heard that John was delivered up.

The truth in these matters must lie in their spiritual meaning ;<sup>1</sup> or, the discrepancy not being solved, faith concerning the Gospels must be abandoned on the ground that they are not true nor written by a divine Spirit, or successfully remembered<sup>2</sup>. . . . Let those who accept the four Gospels and think the apparent discrepancies not to be solved by allegory, tell us . . . when the Lord came to be at Capernaum ; for if it was after the six days from His Baptism, the sixth being the date of the miracle at Cana, it is clear that He had not been tempted, nor had been in Nazareth, nor had John been delivered up. (Indeed there is no place in John's narrative for the forty days' temptation.) Origen goes through the order of events in John ii, iii. Nicodemus seems to have come to the Lord at Jerusalem. When Jesus was baptizing in the land of Judaea, John had not yet been cast into prison ; he was baptizing in Aenon near to Saleim. If, following the letter of Matthew and the two others, they say that Jesus settled at Capernaum after His temptation, how will they say that both are together true—what Matthew and Mark say, that He withdrew into Galilee because of having heard that John was delivered up, and the

<sup>1</sup> ἐν τοῖς νοητοῖς.

<sup>2</sup> ἐπιτετυγμένως ὑπομνημονευθέντων.

narrative in John, that after other events had taken place besides His stay at Capernaum, John was not yet cast into prison? And in many other cases, if one carefully examine the Gospels with reference to their historical disagreement . . . he will turn dizzy<sup>1</sup> and either abandon ratifying the Gospels as true, and will attach himself at random to one of them, not venturing to reject altogether the faith concerning our Lord; or accepting the four, he will hold that their truth does not lie in the letter. . . . (Origen sets forth this last point of view at length.) It was the aim of the evangelists, when possible, to speak truly both spiritually and literally; but when it was not possible to do both, to prefer the spiritual to the literal, what is spiritually true being often preserved in what is literally false. . . .

8 (6), p. 168. According to the passage before us, we consider that the Saviour on the sixth day when His work at Cana had taken place, came down with His Mother and brethren and disciples to Capernaum, which is interpreted 'Field of Cheer.'<sup>2</sup> For it was right that after the festivity<sup>3</sup> with wine the Saviour should have come along with His Mother and disciples to the Field of Cheer, to cheer with the fruits that would be in the full field, His disciples and the soul which had conceived Him by the Holy Ghost, or those helped there.

(Origen next allegorizes the Lord's brethren and mother in Capernaum.)

11 (9), p. 170. Heracleon, expounding 'After this He went down to Capernaum' says that the beginning of another ministry<sup>4</sup> is signified, 'went down' being not

<sup>1</sup> σκοτεδινιάσας.

<sup>3</sup> εὐωχίαν.

<sup>2</sup> Ἀγρὸς παρακλήσεως.

<sup>4</sup> οἰκονομία.



said idly ; Capernaum signifies these extremities of the world, these things of matter <sup>1</sup> to which He came down ; and because the place was inappropriate <sup>2</sup> He is not said to have done or spoken anything in it. If our Lord were recorded in the other Gospels also as not having done or spoken anything in Capernaum, perhaps we might have been in doubt whether to accept this interpretation. But see Matt. iv. 13, 17 ; Mark i, 14f, 23f ; so Luke iv. 31f. . . . We adduce all these things about what our Saviour said and did at Capernaum in order to confute Heracleon's interpretation. Let him either give two ideas (conceptions <sup>3</sup>) of Capernaum, and establish what they are ; or if unable to do this, let him abstain from saying that the Saviour visited any place in vain. . . . Cp. also Matt. viii. 6f. . . . We have further observed this about Capernaum, that not only in it did He begin to preach ' The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, ' but according to the Three evangelists He worked His first miracles there. But none of the Three as in the case of the miracles which he has first recorded as done at Capernaum made the note of the disciple John over the first work, ' This beginning of signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee ; ' for that done in Capernaum was not the beginning of the signs, because gladness is the primary sign of the Son of God, the Word displaying His own beauty not so much in healing the suffering as in gladdening by the sober draught <sup>4</sup> those who through being healthy are able to attend to feasting.

Frag. 31. It is questioned among many people how Jesus had brothers, since Mary continued a virgin till death. He had not brothers by nature, as the Virgin gave birth to no other, and He Himself was not from

<sup>1</sup> ὑλικά.

<sup>2</sup> ἀνοίκειον.

<sup>3</sup> ἐπινοίας.

<sup>4</sup> πόματι.

Joseph. Therefore it was by law that they were called His brothers, being sons of Joseph by a pre-deceased wife ; since confessedly Mary was called his wife (for a betrothed virgin counts as a wife—Deut. xxii. 24).

## XXII

## JOHN ii. 13-25

**Origen**, John, Tome x. 13 (11), p. 172f. What is the point of the addition 'of the Jews?' for of what other nation is the Passover a feast? therefore it was enough to say 'And the Passover was nigh'. But it may be that since there is such a thing as a human Passover in the case of those not celebrating it according to the mind of Scripture, and a divine one, the true one carried out in spirit and truth, by those who worship God in spirit and truth, what is called 'the Jews' is opposed to the divine. The Lord's ordinance of the Passover is given in Exod. xii. 1f, 'it is the Lord's Passover'; it is not said 'It is your Passover'; for we must observe that in the legislation it is nowhere called 'your Passover,' but while once in the above quotations mentioned without any epithet, it is thrice called 'the Lord's Passover'. For a similar distinction cp. Isa. i. 13f; for the Lord does not call His own the things celebrated by sinners, which are hated by His soul. . . . So in the legislation of Exodus about the Sabbath, Exod. xvi. 23f, 'a Sabbath to the Lord'; and Num. xxviii. 1f. So in Exodus the people is called by God when it does not sin, His own People; but rejecting it at the calf-making He named it 'Moses' People'; compare viii. 20-23 with xxxii. 7. So the feasts, when they are hated of the Lord's soul, are the sinners' feasts, but when ordained by the Lord they are termed 'the Lord's'. . . . A plausible objection to this

view comes from 1 Cor. v. 7, 'Christ *our* Passover is sacrificed'; he does not say 'Christ *the Lord's* Passover is sacrificed'. In reply it must be said either that he simply calls 'our Passover sacrificed' that which was sacrificed for us; or that every feast, including the Passover, truly the Lord's, will be celebrated not in this age nor on earth; but in that to come and in heaven, when the Kingdom of Heaven is come. Concerning these feasts see Hosea ix. 5; Heb. xii. 22f; Col. ii. 16.

(Origen deals at length with the spiritual meaning of the Passover, and how Christ fulfilled it.)

19 (14), p. 179. How was the Jews' Passover near? (Origen runs through Matthew's narrative from the Temptation to ch. ix. Many other things after these take place before Matthew notices the time of the Passover. So with the other evangelists.) It is possible to preserve their intention by bearing in mind what has just been said about Capernaum. The stay there is near to the Jews' Passover, being rather an improvement on it and superior to it. . . .

**Heracleon** nevertheless says: 'This is the great Feast; it was a type of the Saviour's Passion, when the sheep was not only slain, but furnished refreshment by being eaten. By being slain (sacrificed) it signified the Saviour's Passion in the world; but by being eaten, the refreshment at the marriage feast.' (Origen thinks this thin.<sup>1</sup>)

Frag. 32. One of the three public Feasts delivered to the Hebrews by the great hierophant Moses, was what is called the Passover, superior to the other two as signifying the deliverance from Egypt and passage to the Holy Land. So at this festival the whole nation of

<sup>1</sup> ὑδαρῶς.



the Jews from all their cities and villages hastened to Jerusalem; for in that city alone was it laid down by the Law that the Passover was to be sacrificed. The three feasts were named from the God who ordained them; but since the Jews were keeping the feasts no longer according to His ordinance but according to their own appetites and pleasures, the evangelist calls it the Passover not of God but of the Jews. For they came to Jerusalem no longer for worship but for self-enjoyment,<sup>1</sup> for all things for feasting were brought to it from all the places round about and sold in the House of God. For the evangelist has said that oxen and sheep and doves were sold there as in a market. But since it happened that those coming to the feast did not bring sufficient silver,<sup>2</sup> some money-changers contrived to set up tables there and to exchange at a fee,<sup>3</sup> receiving gold from those who needed silver, who had come in order to drink and enjoy themselves rather than to keep the feast. Therefore when the whole Jewish nation was there and indulging in drinking<sup>4</sup> Jesus entering into the House of God drove them all out from thence, having only a scourge of cords. Now this would not be accomplished if it were an ordinary man taking in hand to do this; for He drove out of the House not only the rest of the multitude, but even those who were selling the things for feasting. Let no one consider this thing done by Jesus to be inferior to His other miracles, raising the dead or giving sight to the blind; for not without divine operation was it possible for one man to cast out so great a number, specially of men enraged and athirst for His

<sup>1</sup> τρυφῆς.<sup>3</sup> κολλυβίζειν, τούτεστι δανείζειν.<sup>2</sup> ἀργύρια.<sup>4</sup> μέθαις.

blood. And the Jews themselves, astonished at His daring deed, say immediately to him 'What sign showest Thou, in that thou doest these things?' i. e. 'How great art thou in power, and what religion canst thou establish' <sup>1</sup> in that thou doest these things, daring singlehanded to drive out a whole populous nation, which no one else, though captain or king, has attempted to do with a strong force of soldiers?'

(Preuschen disbelieves the authenticity of this fragment.)

v. 7f. **Clement**, Paed. III. xi. 79, 2. The covetous, the liars, the hypocrites, the adulterators <sup>2</sup> of the truth, the Lord cast out from His Father's House, not willing that the holy House of God should be the house of unrighteous trading of worldly or material things.

**Origen**, John, Tome x. 20 (15), 180. John makes the cleansing of the Temple Jesus' second work; the others put the like almost at the end of His ministry, at the time of the Passion. (Origen quotes each of the Synoptists). . . . We must moreover notice that the like to what is said by the Three as occurring at the Lord's ascent to Jerusalem, at which He did these things in the Temple, is recorded by John to have taken place long after, in another visit to Jerusalem, after this one. (Origen quotes the account of the Triumphal Entry given in each Gospel. See § 122). . . .

22, p. 183. The Three relate at one and the same visit of the Lord to Jerusalem what are thought by most people to be identical with the things written by John; but John declares the events to have taken place at two ascents to Jerusalem, divided by many intermediate actions related, and by visits of the Lord to different

<sup>1</sup> τελεῖν.

<sup>2</sup> καπηλεύοντας.

places. Origen considers it impossible to harmonize this discrepancy literally. . . .

Jerusalem is, as the Lord Himself teaches in the Gospel according to Matthew, the City of the Great King, not lying in a hollow or anywhere below, but built on a high mountain—cp. Ps. cxxv. 2; cxxii. 3, 4. . . He found in the Temple which is said to be the Saviour's Father's House, that is, in the Church, or in the profession<sup>1</sup> of the sound word of the Church, certain men making His Father's House a house of merchandise. And Jesus always finds some such in the Temple, viz. in what is called the Church which is a house of the living God, pillar and stay of the truth, and He casts them out.

(His action was also a sign of His bringing material sacrifices to an end, and of the abolition of corporeal laws not stamped with God's image. . . Or the Temple may be the soul of good natured disposition . . . in which are found, before the instruction given by Jesus, earthly and foolish motions, and things regarded as good while not really so; these He casts out. . . .)

The evangelist made use of what was actually done by the traders at the time of the Jewish feasts; they brought these animals (for sacrifice) into the outer precincts of the Temple. . . .

Yet he who cares for more exact investigation will consider if it was according to the position<sup>2</sup> of Jesus in this life, considered as He was a carpenter's son, to venture to do so great a thing as to drive out a number of traders who had come up to the feast in order to sell to so great a number of people sheep to be sacrificed according to the houses of their families, being many myriads in number, and oxen to be delivered to the

<sup>1</sup> ἐπαγγελία.

<sup>2</sup> ἀξίωμα.



richer men who had vowed so much, and doves which many might buy so as to have good cheer at the festival? while the money-changers do not accuse Jesus of outrage on seeing their money poured out and their tables overturned. But who if struck by the scourge of cords and driven out by him who was regarded among them as of no account would not have seized him and cried out and straightway exacted penalty; especially when having co-operating against Jesus so many persons considering themselves involved in the outrage?

But let us consider whether for the Son of God to take cords and weave a scourge for Himself wherewith to drive them out of the Temple does not express something against due order<sup>1</sup> besides self-will and excessive rashness. But one refuge of defence is left to him who wishes to maintain the literal accuracy; viz. the divine power of Jesus, who was able, when He willed, to quench the kindled wrath of enemies, and to be superior by divine grace to tens of thousands, and to scatter troublous devices, Ps. xxxiii. 10f; so that the literal narrative of this passage, if it actually took place, shows operative power no less than any of the most wonderful miracles which by their divinity called those who beheld them to believe. And it is possible to declare this to be greater than the change of water into wine at Cana, as there lifeless matter was the subject, while here it is the subjugation of the wills of so many thousands. . . .

John says that Jesus said, 'Make not my Father's House a house of merchandise;' the others are rebuked for having made the House of Prayer a den of robbers.

<sup>1</sup> τὸ ἀτακτόν.

The Father's House does not admit of becoming a den of robbers, but only endures at the hand of sinners to be made a house of merchandise. . . .

33 (19), p. 194. Heracleon says the going up to Jerusalem signifies the Lord's ascent from material things to the sphere of the soul<sup>1</sup> which is an image of Jerusalem. He thinks that it is said 'He found in the Temple' and not 'the fore-court',<sup>2</sup> that it may not be thought that the calling alone, without the Spirit, is aided by the Lord; for he considers the Temple<sup>3</sup> to be the Holy of Holies, into which only the High Priest used to enter, where I think he says the spiritual go; but the fore-court, where are the Levites, is a symbol of the psychic who are found in salvation outside the Pleroma. . . . (See further in Introduction, p. 9). If Jesus calls the Temple at Jerusalem the House of His own Father, whereas this Temple was made in honour of the Creator of heaven and earth, are we not directly taught to think the Son of God to be the Son of no other than the Maker of heaven and earth? The Apostles frequented this House of Jesus' Father, as a house of prayer (Acts v. 20; iii. 1, etc.) They would not have done this, had they not known Him to be the same God as the God worshipped by those who honoured<sup>4</sup> that Temple; cp. Acts v. 29f. And how would the disciples, if it were not the House of the same God as the God of Christ, have remembered what is said in the 68th (69th) Psalm, 'the zeal for thy house shall eat me up,' for so it stands in the prophet, not 'hath eaten me up.' But Christ is especially zealous for the house of God in each of us,

<sup>1</sup> τὸν ψυχικὸν τόπον.

<sup>3</sup> τὸ ἱερόν.

<sup>2</sup> προνάω.

<sup>4</sup> ἐκθιαζόντων.



not wanting it to be a house of merchandise, nor the house of prayer to be a den of robbers. He is the Son of a jealous God, if we reasonably understand such expressions in the Scriptures, spoken under a human figure to show that God is not willing for anything alien from His will to mix with the soul of all men, specially of those who are willing to receive the things of the most divine faith. But we must know that Ps. lxviii (lxix) containing 'zeal for Thy House shall eat me up' and a little later 'they gave me gall for my food, and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink,' both of which are recorded in the Gospels, is spoken in the person of Christ, displaying no change of speaker.

But Heracleon most unobservantly thinks that 'zeal for thy house shall eat me up' can be spoken in the person of the powers cast out and destroyed by the Saviour. He cannot keep up the sequence in the Psalm in the person of those powers; it follows according to him that 'they gave me gall for my food' in the Psalm is spoken by those powers. But he was probably confused by 'shall eat me up', as something impossible to have been avowed by Christ; not seeing the usage of anthropopathic language about God and Christ.

v. 15. Frag. 121 (Preuschen). The sins of the transgressors were the scourge of cords made by Jesus, through which those attacked by Him were driven out. For Scripture often names sins 'cords'—Ps. cxix. 61; Prov. v. 22.

v. 16. First Principles, II. iv. 1, p. 84. He doubtless meant by 'Father' the God for whose Name Solomon had created the noble Temple.

Cyprian, Testimonies, iii. 100. Heading 'That God's grace ought to be gratuitous.'

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, viii. 2, 115, p. 401.

The Lord would not have said this, had He not thought that the place ought still to be recognized as honourable.

v. 18. **Origen**, John, Tome x. 35 (20), p. 196. Material<sup>1</sup> men, friends of sensible things, seem meant by the Jews who, indignant at the things performed by Jesus, ask for a sign, according to which sign the Word whom they do not receive will be seen appropriately to do these things. But the Saviour combining the word about His own body as one with that about that Temple, answers 'Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' For though He was able to show innumerable other signs, yet not in answer to the question 'in that thou doest these things'. But He becomingly made answer of things connected with the Temple instead of other signs besides the Temple. Yet both, the Temple and the Body of Jesus, seem to me according to one acceptation to be a figure of the Church, by its being built of living stones, made a spiritual house for a holy priesthood, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus being the chief corner-stone, and called a temple. But through the saying 'Ye are Christ's body, and individually members,' even though the structure<sup>2</sup> of the stones of the Temple may seem to be dissolved, or as is written in Psalm **xxi.** (**xxii**) all Christ's bones to be scattered abroad by plots, persecutions and afflictions at the hands of those who make war on the unity of the Temple by persecutions, yet the Temple will be raised up and the Body will arise on the third day after the present day of evil, and the following day of the End; for a third day will be present in the new heaven and the new earth, when

<sup>1</sup> *σωματικοί.*

<sup>2</sup> *ἁρμονία.*

these bones, all the house of Israel, will be raised on the great Lord's Day after death has been overcome; so that the resurrection of Christ which took place after the suffering of the Cross presents a mystery of the resurrection of the whole Body of Christ. Cp. also Gal. ii. 20; vi. 14; Rom. vi. 4-5. As having come into some earnest of resurrection, the saint says 'We have risen with Him', since he walks in some newness of life, as not yet risen according to the hoped-for blessed and perfect resurrection. . . .

From this temple, which is Christ's Body, must be driven out these irrational things and things of trade, that it be no longer a house of trading. And this Temple must be destroyed by those who plot against the Word of God, and be raised up after its destruction, on the aforesaid third day; when also the disciples will remember what the Word said before the Temple of God was destroyed, and, their faith being then perfected along with their knowledge, will believe not only the Scripture, but also the word which Jesus said. Each of such men, being cleansed by Jesus, having put away things that are irrational and that sell because of the zeal of the Word in them, will be destroyed on terms of being raised by Jesus not *on the third* day as far as the passage before us is concerned—for it is not written 'on the third day I will raise it up'; but '*in three days.*' For the raising of the Temple is on the first and on the second day after its destruction; it is completed in three days in all. Therefore a resurrection has both taken place and a resurrection will come, if we have been buried with Christ and have risen with Him. And since 'We have risen with Him' does not cover the whole resurrection, we read 1 Cor. xv. 22-24. For it was part of resurrection to be in the first day in



the Paradise of God ; part of it when He appears and says ' Touch Me not, for I have not yet ascended to the Father ' ; but the completion of resurrection was when He comes to the Father. But since some are confused about the position of the Father and the Son, combining 1 Cor. xv. 15 and the like which show the Raiser to be distinct from the Raised, and ' Destroy this Temple and in three days I will raise it up,' as though it were established from these that the Son is not numerically distinct from the Father, but Both being actually one not only in essence but also in substratum<sup>1</sup> (underlying thought), are called Father and Son according to different conceptions, not personally ; we must say to them, first, that the very words primarily establish that the Son is distinct from the Father, and that of necessity the Son is Son of a Father, and the Father Father of a Son. Next, it is not unreasonable that He who acknowledges John v. 19, has raised the dead, as the body was, by the grant of the Father, who primarily is to be said to have raised up Christ from the dead.

Yet *Heracleon* says ' In three ' stands for ' on the third ' ; not having examined, while yet having noticed the expression ' in three ', how the resurrection is effected in three days. Moreover he says the third day is the spiritual one, in which they think is shown the resurrection of the Church. It is in accordance with these things to say that the earthly day is the first and the psychic the second, the resurrection of the Church not having taken place in them.

It seems likely that the words of the false witnesses recorded by Matthew and Mark have reference to this saying. . . .

<sup>1</sup> ὑποκειμένω.

Matt. xxvi. 61 ; Mark xiv. 58 see § 156 ; so Celsus II. 10, p. 394.

VIII. 19, p. 757. A superior Temple to all so-called temples was the sacred and pure body of our Saviour Jesus, who knowing that the Temple of God within Him might be plotted against by the ungodly, yet not so that the purpose of the plotters would be stronger than the Divinity that built the Temple, says, to them, *vv.* 19, 21.

(Our bodies are temples of God ; Christ's was the most excellent.)

Matthew, § 108, p. 909. The false witnesses of Matt. xxvi. 61, reported Him to have said what He had not said. . . . He did not promise to commit the impiety of destroying the Temple ; but committed it to those who were fit for this work, saying ' Destroy this Temple '. What He reserved for Himself is ' And I in three days, will raise it up '. And what He said of the Temple of His body the Jews, prejudiced by malice, misunderstood, and took it to mean that Temple of stone ; this is clear from their question, *v.* 20.

Tertullian, Resurrection of Flesh, 18. The flesh *falls* through death. This lot of the body was also expressed by our Lord when He, clad with this substance, said ' Destroy this Temple, and I will raise it up again in three days '. For He showed to what it belongs to be destroyed, overthrown, lie prostrate, and also to be lifted again and raised again ; although He also carried a soul trembling even to death, yet not falling through death ;—because also Scripture says He had spoken of His body.

Chastity (Pudicitia) 16. ' Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ ? ' because Christ also was God's Temple ; ' Destroy this temple and I will raise it again in three days. '

**Novatian**, *Trinity*, 21. This the Lord said in the Gospel, to express His own majesty.

v. 20. **Origen**, *John*, Tome x. 38 (22), p. 200. How the Jews say the Temple to have been built in Forty-six years we cannot say, if we follow the history. From the account of 1 Kings, if we reckon in the preparation with the time of the building, eleven years in all are not completely taken for the building of the Temple. . . . Unless anyone should in a forced way reckon the forty-six years from David's words to Nathan, 2 Sam. vii. 2. David, though prevented from building by being a man of blood, seems to have been occupied with the collection of material (1 Chron. xxix). David reigned seven years in Hebron, and thirty-three in Jerusalem. If then anyone may be able to show that his preparations for the Temple began in the fifth year of his reign, he will be able—in a forced way—to speak about the forty-six years.

But another man will say that the Temple to which they point is not Solomon's, for that was destroyed at the time of the Captivity, but that built under Ezra. Of this we cannot clearly show the truth of the saying about the forty-six years. It appears also that in Maccabean times there was much disturbance<sup>1</sup> about the people and the temple, and I do not know whether then the Temple was rebuilt in so many years.

Yet **Heracleon**, not attending to the history, says that Solomon in forty-six years built the Temple, which is an image of the Saviour. (His interpretation is obscure.)

**Eusebius**, *Gospel Demonstration*, viii. 2, 64, p. 392. They said that the Temple had been built in forty-six

<sup>1</sup> ἀκαταστασία.



years, for it was so many years from the first year of Cyrus, who first allowed those Jews who wished to return from Babylon to their own land, to the sixth year of Darius, under whom the whole work of building reached completion.

Prophetic Selections, iii. 46. (Forty-six years from the decree of Cyrus to the completion under Darius.) Cyrus reigned thirty-one years, Cambyses nine ; Darius succeeds him, and again after Cyrus commands Jerusalem to be built. It is completed in the sixth year of his reign, the forty-sixth year from Cyrus. This was the basis of the question asked of our Lord. Josephus makes it forty-nine years, finishing in the ninth year of Darius.

[In fact the period from Cyrus' conquest of Babylon to the sixth year of Darius is only twenty-two years.]

(Cyprian), Sinai and Sion, 4. 'Forty-six,' the sum of the letters of Adam (A.D.A.M.) declare the passion of Adam's flesh. . . . The number declares Christ's Passion, because suffering on the sixth hour in the 6000th year and rising from the dead He ascended into heaven on the fortieth day ; or because Solomon built a temple to God in forty-six years, after the likeness of which temple Jesus said His flesh to be saying to the Pharisees John ii. 19. And the Pharisees said (*v.* 20).

Reckoning of Easter, 15. In which city the Temple which after the likeness of Adam had been destroyed, was in His name built again in forty-six years.

Origen, Tome x. 39 (23), p. 202. If the Body of Jesus is called His Temple, it is worth investigation whether this is to be understood more simply, or whether we should aim at applying to Christ's body each of the things written about the Temple ; whether the Body which He took of the Virgin, or the Church which is

said to be His Body, so that we are called by the Apostle members of His Body. The man who avoids trouble by despairing of his ability to refer each of the details of the Temple to the Body will in either case have recourse to a simple explanation, saying that the Body in either sense has been named the temple just because, as the Temple had the glory of God dwelling in it, so the Body or the Church having the Firstborn of all creation, the Image and Glory of God, has been fitly called a Temple holding an Image. [The Greek is corrupt here.] It is hard to apply each detail of the account in 1 (3) Kings. . . . But cp. 1 Peter ii. 5. . . . The son of David who built the Temple is a type of Christ; he built it in profound peace after wars, to the glory of God. . . . Perhaps if all His enemies become Christ's footstool, and the last enemy, Death, is brought to naught, there will be the most perfect peace when Christ will be Solomon, the Peaceful. . . . Then each of the living stones according to the merit of his life here, will be a stone of the Temple; one an Apostle or prophet in the foundation, supporting those resting upon him; another supported by the apostles and himself with them supporting his inferiors; one a stone of the innermost sanctuary, another of the outer precincts. . . .

(Origen allegorizes the accounts of the building of Solomon's Temple and quotes Isa. liv. and lx.)

v. 22. 43 (27), p. 208. Literally, this means that the disciples after the Lord had risen from the dead understood that what had been said about the Temple had reference to His Passion and Resurrection, remembering that 'In three days I will raise it' signified the Resurrection; when also they believed the Scripture and the word that Jesus said; they are not previously testified to have believed the Scripture or this word of



His ; for properly faith belongs to him who in baptism receives with his whole soul what is believed. But allegorically since the resurrection from the dead has been previously said to be that of the Lord's whole Body, we must know that the disciples, reminded by the events of the Scripture which was not accurately understood by them while still in life, now coming under sight and becoming manifest in respect of what heavenly things it was an example and shadow, believe what previously they did not believe, and the word of Jesus which before the Resurrection they did not understand according to the meaning of the Saviour. For how can anyone be properly said to believe the Scripture, without beholding the mind of the Holy Spirit in it, which God wants to be believed, rather than the meaning of the letter ? . . . .

v. 23f. 44 (28), p. 209. It may be enquired how it was that Jesus did not trust Himself to those who are testified to believe. We must say that it is not to those who believe in Him that Jesus does not trust Himself, but to those who believe in His Name ; for believing in His Name is different from believing in Him. He who because of faith will not be judged is not judged by believing in Him, not in His Name (John iii. 18, q. v.) Therefore Jesus does not entrust Himself to him who believes in His Name. We ought then to hold to Him rather than to His Name, that we may not, doing mighty works in His Name, have said to us what is said to those who boasted in the Name only—(Matt. vii. 22), but have boldness, following Paul, to say 'I can do all things in Him Who strengtheneth me, Christ Jesus.'

We must also notice that above it is said 'the Jews' Passover was near' ; but here not 'at *the Jews'* Passover,' but 'at *the* Passover' was Jesus at Jerusalem. There,

when it is called the Jews' Passover, it is not termed a feast, but here Jesus is recorded to be at the feast. . . .

Notice also that many are said to believe not in Him but in His Name. Those who believe in Him are those who walk the strait and narrow way which leads to life, found by the few. Yet it is possible for many of those who believe in His Name to sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven . . . which is the Father's House in which there are many dwellings.

Many believing in His Name do not believe as Andrew and Peter and Nathanael and Philip believe, but 'believed beholding the signs which He did'. . . .

'He had no need for any to bear witness of a man' may be suitably used to show that the Son of God is of Himself able to consider<sup>1</sup> concerning each individual man, and in no way needs testimony from anyone. (Origen next discusses whether the word 'man' need imply that He had such need in the case of higher beings.)

We must also investigate how many signs the many saw and so believed in Him; for He is not recorded to have done signs at Jerusalem, unless indeed they were done without being recorded. The Cleansing of the Temple may perhaps reckon as such.

To those who suppose that it was of men alone that He had no need of witness, it must be said that the evangelist has borne a double witness to Him, both that He knew all and that He had no need that any one should bear witness of a man. For if He knew all He knew not only men, but also the things above man, and those who are without such bodies; and He knew what was in the man, as being greater than those who by prophesying convict and judge and bring to light the

<sup>1</sup> θεωρεῖν.

secrets of the heart suggested by the Spirit (1 Cor. xiv. 24). But 'He knew what was in the man' may be taken of the good or evil powers working in men. For if any one gives place to the devil, Satan enters into him (John xiii. 2, 27); but if he gives place to God, he becomes blessed. Therefore the Son of God Who knows all things, knows what is in the man.

Frag. 33. They believed not in Him but in His Name. These had not secure nor perfect knowledge . . . but one which could very easily fall through. Wherefore He did not trust Himself to them, because He knew all things not superficially, but from the depth of the mind. For to know some people from actions and words is possible even for a mere man; but Jesus, not being a mere man but the God-man, knows all things, comprehending the secret things of the mind. For of God alone it is said 'who hast knowledge<sup>1</sup> of secrets, and knowest all things before they come to be.'<sup>2</sup> Since then Jesus, being God, knows the secret of the heart, He does not need to receive witness from a man, knowing what is in the man. For it is not said that He knew simply the man, but what was in the man. And since He knew they were not abiding in the faith they had in His Name, He did not trust Himself to them. For they had believed from signs, not from understanding about God. Therefore they might soon fall away, likely to be deceived either of themselves, or by some falsely persuading them that the signs were not truly or not rightly done. But He who believes in Him is not easily deceived, having grasp from God.

Eusebius, Ps. xxxii (xxxiii) 14. Contrast 1 Cor. ii. 11. Of our Saviour alone is it said, to establish His Godhead, 'For he knew what was in the man.'

<sup>1</sup> γνωστής.

<sup>2</sup> Susanna 42.



## XXIII

## JOHN iii. 1-21

**Origen**, John, Frag. 34. Among the many who had believed in the name of Jesus is to be ranked also Nicodemus. He certainly regarded Jesus to be a teacher having God with Him, but not to be God, as his own words show, 'From God thou art come a teacher'; and as implying the truth of his knowledge of Him as a teacher he next says 'for no one can do these signs which thou workest, except God be with him.' Hence the evangelist has naturally recorded his coming as having taken place by night—a time in which he would escape the notice of the many Pharisees of whom he was one. Or rather, as is incontestable, he came by night for this reason: because he had ignorance of God to whom he was coming, and had not yet been enlightened; for not yet had there risen upon him the sun of righteousness, which makes the spiritual day, which day Abraham craved for and was prepared to see, and beholding it rejoiced. The Pharisees are men who are followers of the leading order and school in Judaism, professing a strenuous life and exact observance of the Law and the Prophets. Therefore they are generally bold and proud. Hence also they have taken their appellation; for 'Phares', among the Hebrews means 'He who is separated.' Since then these also separate themselves from the whole nation of the Jews as being superior in understanding and life, they choose to take their name from Phares.

v. 3. Frag. 35. 'ἀνωθεν' sometimes means 'from above' or 'from on high,' as in John iii. 31; sometimes 'again' as in Gal. iv. 9. But the birth from

above <sup>1</sup> of which the Saviour is teaching, comes by reception of virtue and keeping of His commandments; for He says to His disciples Matt. v. 44 . . . 'that ye may become sons of your Father who is in heaven.' But though Nicodemus met mistakenly what was said to him, yet there is some truth in his words, even if he did not understand them. For in truth no one remaining 'a man' so as to grow old in human condition can receive the birth according to Spirit and from above. For as no one continuing unrighteous or unbelieving can be born according to righteousness and faith, so no one continuing in human things and growing old in them is able to receive the birth that renews. Therefore the teacher of truth writes to those who are eager to come to the divine birth, to put off the old man with his actions, that having the cast this away they may put on the new man created according to God in righteousness; which is accompanied, as born from above, by walking in newness of life. Jesus exhorting to this birth, said to His followers Matt. xviii. 3 (q.v.) . . . He wants us to be such by disposition as children are by age. . . . If therefore Nicodemus said in ignorance the words before us, yet in his words there lay some truth unknown to him.

Romans, Book V 8, p. 561. (He refers to what he has written on John.) The Greek word *ἀνωθεν* has the double meaning of 'anew' and 'from above.' Here it must mean 'from above.' We say 'anew' when things which have already been done are repeated; but here the same birth is not repeated or done again, but this earthly one is left, and a new birth from above is received; therefore we should read more correctly in the Gospels 'Except a man have been born from above he

<sup>1</sup> *ἀνωθεν*.

cannot enter into the kingdom of God'; for this is to be baptized in the Holy Spirit. As a confirmation of the argument that baptism is from above, we may fairly associate with the Holy Spirit the waters above the heavens, which praise the name of the Lord. And although according to the sign <sup>1</sup> delivered to the churches we have all been baptized in these visible waters and with visible anointing, yet he who is dead to sin and is truly baptized in the death of Christ and buried with Him through baptism unto death, he is truly baptized in the Holy Spirit and water from above.

**Cyprian**, To Donatus, 3. Cyprian had found it hard to believe what was promised by the divine mercy, that any one may be re-born anew <sup>2</sup> and, quickened unto a new life by washing of water of salvation, may lay aside what he has previously been and though the fabric of his body remains, may change the man in mind and character (*anima et mente*).

**Athanasius**, Incarnation, 14. He said to the Jews 'Except one be regenerate,' signifying not the birth from women, as they supposed, but meaning the regeneration and recreation of the soul in accordance with the divine image.

**Justin**, Apology i. 61. Then they are brought by us to some place where there is water, and regenerated in the way we ourselves were regenerated; for in the name of God the Father and Master of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit they then receive washing in water. For indeed Christ said 'Except ye be regenerated, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.' But that it is indeed impossible for those once born to enter into their mothers' wombs, is clear to all.

<sup>1</sup> typum.

<sup>2</sup> renasci denuo.



**Irenaeus**, Frag. 33. We being like Naaman, lepers in our sins, are cleansed from our old transgressions through the holy water and invocation of the Lord, being regenerated spiritually as new-born babes ; as also the Lord said ' Except one be regenerated through water and spirit, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.'

**Hippolytus**, Heresies, viii. 10 (3). *Docetae* interpret this as confirming their view that Jesus received a new (spiritual) body at His baptism.

Theophany 8. (Baptism is through water and Holy Spirit.)

**Clement**, Prophetic Selections, 7-8. Regeneration is like all creation, Gen. i. 2, through water and Spirit. Baptism takes place through water and Spirit.

**Origen**, Luke, Hom. xiv, p. 948. Because through the sacrament of Baptism the defilements <sup>1</sup> of birth are laid aside, therefore even little ones are baptized ; for ' except one be reborn of water and Spirit he will not be able to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.'

**John**, Frag. 36. The Saviour interprets how it is possible to be born from above, saying that since entrance into God's Kingdom is set before us, but it is impossible for any to attain this without having been born of water and Spirit, it follows that to be born from above is by being born of water and Spirit. But he is born of (the) Spirit, who is made according to it, becoming from it holy and spiritual. Then, since he who enters into the Kingdom of God is born not of the Spirit alone, but also of water, it follows that we should search out from Scripture something also about water. And consider whether it does not differ from the Spirit merely in conception and not in substance. See John vii. 38-39.

<sup>1</sup> sordes.

For if it is said of the Spirit that living water flows like rivers from the believer, the water will differ from the Spirit only in conception.<sup>1</sup> As then any one is born of the Saviour wise from Wisdom, so also of the Spirit he is born holy and spiritual, and of the water he is born cleansed, and each man watered for fruit-bearing is born of water and Spirit.

Another will say that 'water' means here the teaching which cleanses the soul, which itself contributes to being born from above. Of this cleansing by divine education the Psalmist said to God, 'Thou shalt wash me and I shall be whiter than snow'; cp. Jer. iv. 14. Then since not only is the soul called to salvation, but also the very body, which it uses as an instrument for its own operations; naturally this too must be sanctified through what is called in the divine teaching 'washing of regeneration,' which is also named divine Baptism, no longer mere water, for it is sanctified by some mystic invocation; cp. Matt. xxviii. 19f. . . . How can it any more be mere water which has partaken as far as possible of the power of the Holy Trinity and is associated with moral and intellectual virtue? Consider too its greatness by considering wherefore it is received. For if it is in order to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, and this is of surpassing excellence; how is not the cause of entrance into it a great thing? The Kingdom of God means the constitution of those who live orderly according to His Laws. But this has its abode in a proper place, I mean in heaven. Since it is here called 'Kingdom of God,' but in Matthew 'Kingdom of Heaven,' we must say that Matthew has named it from its subjects, or the places in which they are, while John and Luke

<sup>1</sup> ἐπίνοια.

have named it from its King, even God ; as when we, speaking of the Kingdom of the Romans, designate it through its subjects, signifying it also from the place on the earth or the world. . . .

Romans, Book V. 9, p. 565. The Church has received a tradition from the apostles to give baptism even to little ones.<sup>1</sup> For they to whom the secrets of divine mysteries had been entrusted knew that there are in all people genuine defilements<sup>2</sup> of sin, which ought to be washed away through water and Spirit.

Tertullian, Baptism, 12. Since it is laid down that no one receives salvation without baptism, specially as the Lord declares 'Except one shall be born of water, he has not life,' how then about the apostles themselves, whom we do not find baptized in the Lord? (Tertullian's answer is that they must have been baptized with John's baptism.) Others indeed in a forced enough way suppose the apostles to have been baptized when they were sprinkled and covered with the waves in the boat, and Peter when walking through the sea. But such sprinkling is quite different. . . . The privilege of first choice and so of unbroken intercourse might for them supply the place<sup>3</sup> of Baptism.

13. The statement 'Except any one be born again of water and Spirit, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven,' combined with Matt. xxviii. 19, has bound faith to the necessity of baptism. Therefore henceforth all believers were baptized—as was Paul.

Soul, 39. The Lord's limitation<sup>4</sup> 'Except any one shall be born from water and Spirit, he will not enter into the Kingdom of God,' i.e. he will not be holy.

<sup>1</sup> parvulis.

<sup>3</sup> compendium conferre.

<sup>2</sup> sordes.

<sup>4</sup> definitio.



Cyprian, Testimonies, i. 12. Heading 'That the old baptism was to cease and a new begin.'

III. 25 (combining iii. 5 and vi. 53). Heading, 'None can come to the Kingdom of God, unless he have been baptized and born again.'

Epistle lxxii. 1. (Imposition of hands for the reception of the Holy Spirit is insufficient for those with heretical baptism, unless they receive also the baptism of the Church.) For then only can they be fully sanctified and be sons of God, if they are born with both sacraments, even as it is written 'Except any one have been born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.'

So lxxiii, 21.

Opinions of Bishops, 5. *Nemesianus* of Thubunas. Heretical and schismatic baptism cannot be a true one . . . for in the Gospel our Lord Christ said with His own divine voice, 'Except any one have been born again of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.' This is the Spirit who in the beginning moved upon the water. For neither can the Spirit work separately without the water, nor the water without the Spirit. Ill therefore is the interpretation of some who say that they by imposition of hands receive the Holy Spirit, and so are received, since it is clear that they ought to be born anew in the Catholic Church by both sacraments. . . . Again the Lord says in the Gospel, 'What is born of the flesh is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit, because God is Spirit and he is born of God.' Therefore the things done by all heretics and schismatics are of the flesh—Gal. v. 19f. . . Unless therefore they have received saving Baptism in the one Catholic Church, they cannot be saved, but will be condemned with the carnal in the judgment of the Lord Christ.

Rebaptism, 3. You may straightway answer, as you are wont, that the Lord said in the Gospel, 'Except any one have been born anew of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.' From which it is clear that the baptism alone can profit in which the Holy Spirit also is . . . (yet there are instances in Scripture of the two being given separately, as in the case of the Samaritans baptized by Philip, Acts viii).

Eusebius, on Isaiah (i. 16). 'Except one be reborn from <sup>1</sup> water and Spirit he shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven,' confirms the promise of Isaiah.

On iii. 1. We come to the grace which is through Holy Baptism, and we say that the virtue of the water which sanctifies us is the laying aside of sins, spiritual regeneration into conformity with Christ Himself, and further, confidence to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven ; for He says 'Except one be born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.'

Clementine Recognitions, vi. 9. You may perhaps ask 'What does water-baptism contribute to God's religion?' First, because what God has willed is performed. Secondly, because to one regenerated from the waters and new born to God, the frailty of your former human birth is removed, and so you can at last attain to salvation ; otherwise it is impossible. For so the true Prophet testified to us with an oath, saying 'Amen I say to you, Except one be reborn anew from water, he will not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.'

So Homilies, xi. 26, where the quotation runs 'Verily I say to you, Except ye are regenerated with living water in the name of the Father, Son, Holy Spirit, ye will not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.'

<sup>1</sup> ἐκ.

v. 6. **Hippolytus**, Noetus, 16. 'What is born of the Spirit is spirit.' This is sufficient knowledge of Christ's divine generation.

Heresies, v. 7 (2). *Naassenes*.

**Clement**, Storm, III. xii. 84, 3. As what is born of the flesh is flesh, so what is born of the Spirit is spirit; not only as regards parturition<sup>1</sup> but also as regards learning.<sup>2</sup>

**Origen**, Romans, Cramer's Catena. J. Th. St. xiii. 223, on iii. 30. (Discussing the difference between ἐκ from, and διὰ through.) Since what is born of the flesh is flesh, the Saviour's flesh, not coming from man, has come *from* woman and not *through* woman.

**Tertullian**, Flesh of Christ, 18. From what is it more suitable to believe the Word to have been made flesh, than from flesh, *in* which also He was made? even because the Lord Himself definitely laid down 'What is born in flesh is flesh, because it is born of flesh.' But if He said this only of a man, and not also of Himself, then deny Christ to be man, and so maintain that it did not include Him. But He adds 'And what is born of the Spirit is spirit, because God is spirit and he is born of God.' This certainly applies definitely to Himself, if it does also to those who believe in Him.

**Praxeas**, 27. (Christ's flesh and spirit both acted separately according to their own properties). Learn then with Nicodemus that what is born in the flesh is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit. Neither does flesh become spirit, nor spirit flesh. They can indeed be in one. Of these Jesus consisted—man of flesh, God of the Spirit.

<sup>1</sup> ἀποκύησιν.

<sup>2</sup> μάθησιν.



v. 8. **Ignatius**, Philadelphians, 7. The Spirit is not deceived, being from God, for He knows whence He comes and whither He goes, and exposes<sup>1</sup> hidden things.

**Origen**, First Principles, I. iii. 4, p. 61. The Holy Spirit who alone searches even the deep things of God, reveals God to whom He will. For the Spirit breathes where He will.

**John**, Frag. 37. The Holy Spirit visits only the virtuous,<sup>2</sup> being far from the worthless. But 'far off' and 'near' are not to be understood locally, but as it is possible to understand them of incorporeal beings. For such words when written also of God the Father do not imply local distances. Since then the Spirit while alienated from the worthless fills those who have faith and virtue, it is fitly said 'The Spirit breathes where He wills.' This also signifies that the Spirit is a real being ;<sup>3</sup> for He is not, as some think, an operation of God, having as they think no separate existence.<sup>4</sup> And the Apostle, having reckoned up the gifts of the Spirit, straightway added, 'But all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing separately to each man as He wills.' But if He wills, He also works and divides ; He is then an operating Being, not an operation. (Cp. also Acts xv. 28 ; xiii. 2 ; xxi. 10). . . . But if the Spirit breathes where He will, Nicodemus not having Him in himself, by not having rightly believed Jesus, hearing only His voice, knows not whither He goes and whence He comes. He who reads the Scriptures of the Spirit without understanding them, only hears His voice, while every one who attends to the reading and searches

<sup>1</sup> ἐλέγχει.

<sup>3</sup> οὐσία.

<sup>2</sup> σπουδαίοις.

<sup>4</sup> ὑπάρξεως ιδιότητα.



the Scriptures in understanding them, knows whence the way of the Spirit comes and where it ends—the way He takes through the instruction of the divine oracles. For any one knowing the cause from which the teaching of the Spirit is given to men, knows whence He comes; but also beholding wherefore and to what end it is given, he knows whither He goes.

(Cyprian), Rebaptism, 15. The Lord has taught us most clearly the liberty and readiness<sup>1</sup> of the Holy Spirit in freely coming. . . . He comes sometimes upon the unworthy, as Saul.

18. The Spirit remains to-day invisible to men, as the Lord said.

v. 12. Origen, John, Frag. 38. It is worthy of investigation how the Saviour said He had spoken of earthly things, when He had been teaching about God's Kingdom and the Birth from above, and the Holy Spirit and being born of Him; for none of these is earthly, but each is heavenly. But it may be said in reply to this, that Jesus did not say 'If I told you earthly things'<sup>2</sup> but 'things on earth';<sup>3</sup> for they, being not of their own nature things on earth, but heavenly, are freely given by God to men. But that the things given to men on earth are from above and spiritual, James writes (i. 17). This he said, having learnt from the Saviour who says Matt. vii. 11. Then, since of the things supplied by God some may be supplied to those who know in part, but others to those who have come to perfection in the age to come, when what is in part will be done away when what is perfect is come, it is quite suitably said 'How if I tell you the heavenly things will ye believe?'

<sup>1</sup> facultatem.

<sup>2</sup> γήϊνα.

<sup>3</sup> ἐπίγεια.

because he who does not believe in part will not believe also the perfect things.

v. 13. **Hippolytus**, Noetus, 4. Would he say that flesh was in heaven? . . . Who was in heaven but the fleshless <sup>1</sup> Word, sent to show Himself, while on earth, to be also in heaven?

**Origen**, Romans, Book VIII. 2, p. 622. Let us not say in our heart, nor think, that Christ is contained in any place and is not everywhere and spread through all things; since when He was on earth He said He was also in heaven; for so He said to His apostles, John iii. 13. He did not say 'Who *was* in heaven,' but 'Who *is* in heaven.'

**Adamantius**, v. 7 (p. 855). (The Greek omits 'who is in heaven'; the Latin reads it.) 'You see', says *Marinus*, 'how clearly He says He has come down from heaven.'

**Adamantius** rejoins, 'The Gospel has clearly shown that, unless the Word came down from heaven, man could not have gone up to heaven. "Hath come down" signifies a time *past*. For He did not say, No one will go up, but, No one hath gone up. He has thus shown clearly that no one has ascended before Christ. But after His Ascension His People will ascend.'

**Eusebius**, Prophetic Selections, ii. 10, on Psalm xix. 6 (applies verse, without 'Who is in heaven').

v. 14. **Hippolytus**, Heresies, v. 16 (11). The *Peratae* used the narratives of the Brazen Serpent and the comment here.

**Epiphanius**, Heresies, 37, 7, p. 274. The Ophites pervert this to support their views. (So Tertullian, All Heresies, 2.)

<sup>1</sup> ἄσαρκος.

**Irenaeus**, IV. iv. 2, H.; IV. ii. 7, p. 230, M. The law urged men to believe on the Son of God, saying that men are not otherwise saved from the old wound of the serpent, unless they believe on Him who after the likeness of flesh of sin is on the tree of witness (martyrii) lifted up from the earth and who draws all things to Him and quickens the dead.

**Origen** (or Apollinarius), John, Frag. 39. The making of the serpent had been commanded by God, that those led by Moses might be able to know that just as disbelieving God who promised them the land they were slain by venomous beasts, so they would be able to be saved by fixing their eyes on the uplifted serpent, because of God who commanded this to be done. For it was not the nature of the constitution, but He who commanded this to be made, that afforded the cause of their salvation. And spiritual serpents subjected men to death through sins, injecting the poison of their own wickedness. And when the death prevailing over the souls had become widespread—this is what follows sin—God being intreated was pleased that His own Son should be lifted up, that all those who look unto Him through faith may be freed from the hurt of the spiritual serpents and have eternal life. But eternal life is not the common life which belongs also to other animals, but that produced by faith and other parts of virtue.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies, ii. 20. Heading 'That the Jews were to crucify Him.'

v. 16f. **Tertullian**, Praxeas, 20. Distinction between Father and Son is shown when He says to Nicodemus (vv. 16–18).

v. 16. **Origen**, Numbers, Hom. XXIV. 2, p. 364. God gave man many blessings, but after all these things

He gave Himself. For 'God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son for the life of the world.'

*v.* 17. Hippolytus, Heresies, V. 12 (7). The Peratae quote 'For the Son of Man came not into the world to destroy the world, but that the world through Him may be saved.'

*v.* 17. Origen, John, Frag. 40. From the present passage we can refute those who say that the title of 'Son' applies only to Him who is from Mary, not to God the Word. For behold it is the Son of God Who was sent into the world. But what was sent into the world was not what was taken from the Virgin (for it then first consisted, being born from her), but God the Word, being also Truth and True Light. So Ps. xliii. 3; cvii. 20.

*vv.* 17-18. Frag. 41. But it will be said that the interpretation, that Jesus had not come to judge the world *now*, is not quite wisely conceived; *v.* 19 will be alleged in answer, also ix. 39. This difficulty must be met. Jesus indeed on His coming does both, judging the world and saving it. Yet the one is because of the other. For He has come for judgment into the world, in order to save it; He does not save in order to judge. He comes as a physician to a sick man in order to cure him; for this is the object of the coming of the physician, even though other things may be done, as cutting or burning; for he does not come primarily for cutting or burning, but for curing.

He that believeth in Him is not judged, for he who has attained by faith to perfect salvation is not liable to judgment. But he who has not believed, being self-condemned, has been already judged.

*v.* 18. Irenaeus, V. xxvii. 2, p. 325, M. 'Is not



judged', i. e. is not separated from God, for he is made one with God through faith. 'Hath not believed in the name of the Only Begotten Son of God', i. e. has separated himself from God by his free choice.

**Clement**, Strom, II. xv. 69, 1.

**Origen**, Psalm lxxi (lxxii), 4, p. 761. If 'he that believeth is not judged' perhaps he who is rich in all utterance and knowledge and good works is not judged; but he who has not attained to such faith is judged; yet not as having fallen away, so as to be among those of whom it is said 'He that believeth not has been judged already'. By 'he that believeth not' I understand him who disbelieves.<sup>1</sup>

**John**, Tome x. 44, p. 210. 'He that believeth in Me is not judged'; not 'he that believeth in My Name'. But He does not add 'He that believeth not in Me hath been already judged', for perhaps he who believes in His Name does indeed believe, and therefore does not deserve to have been judged already, but is inferior to him who believes in Him.

**Romans**, Book II. 17, p. 484. Let us see how we who believe Christ are not judged, that we may know how he who does not believe is already judged. Do we think that one who has believed in Christ and has afterwards committed murder or adultery or false witness, will not be judged for these things? It is certain that all these things come to judgment; therefore the Lord's saying is to be understood as meaning that in virtue of his having believed he will not be judged as an unbeliever; but he will doubtless be judged for his actions. So therefore he who does not believe has been already judged in respect of his not having believed . . . but if

<sup>1</sup> ὁ ἀπιστῶν.

he has done any good work apart from his unbelief, his reward will not perish. It may indeed be objected, that he who sins is not to be reckoned among believers, because if any one believes he does not sin ; if he sins, it is shown by this very fact that he does not believe. But this view is hard and intolerable. Who is absolutely free from sin ? Cp. 1 John i. 8 ; ii. 1.

*vv.* 18-19. **Cyprian.** Testimonies i. 7 ; iii. 31.

*v.* 19. **Origen,** John, Frag. 42. If the Light had not come into the world those who did not do good things could have pleaded their ignorance of them, just as those working evil things would have the excuse that they did not know that they were evil. But since the Light has come into the world, every fabricated defence is driven away, and there will be a judgment examining the actions and mind <sup>1</sup> of each, so that those who have loved the Light may be welcomed and attain the Kingdom of God, and, being themselves made light from their love to it, may through their good works and true mind, hate the darkness, i.e. evil and impiety ; but those who have turned away from virtue and God who supplies it may experience eternal punishment, seeing that in their keenness for evil works they hated the light, which by manifestation exposed their evil works ; for ‘ every one that doeth evil hateth the light ’, in no wise willing to come to it, that his works may not be exposed as evil, seeking to conceal them that they may not be condemned by others. But though this man hates the light, yet the doer of the truth comes to the light, wishing for the manifestation of the works done by him, that they have been wrought in God.

He said well ‘ He that *practiseth* evil ’,<sup>2</sup> or ‘ he that

<sup>1</sup> φρόνημα.

<sup>2</sup> ὁ τὰ φαῦλα πράσσων.

*doeth*<sup>1</sup> the truth', not 'he who *hath practised*' or '*hath done*'. For it is possible for him who has done evil to withdraw from evil and look to good; and for him who professes to rejoice in the truth to turn aside to what is worse. Therefore He says 'practising' and 'doing' (*presents*). For it is not possible for him who is disposed to evil to rejoice in truth; and the lover of truth is always desirous of good things.

But coming and not coming to the light is to be understood not locally but operatively—every one comes to it who acts according to virtue. For the worthless man working evil, refuses to associate with light; for good and evil, light and darkness, cannot co-exist; light and good are here identical, as are darkness and evil. But since the heretics think that some by nature are in darkness and love it, notice that it is said that each of them is by choice in darkness and loves it (*v.* 19). For they do not have evil works because there is darkness; but because they have evil works they love the darkness. And again it is not by not coming to the light that they do evil; but by doing evil they do not come to the light. It rests with us to do evil or to love the light and do the truth.

Frag. 43. We must examine whether, loving both, they loved the darkness more and the light less; there seems to be room for this in the case of those who are neither extremely bad men nor yet perfect in virtue. But I think that this is not what is meant, but something of this kind—Men have free-will; they ought to welcome the light, and shun the darkness; those who have evil works have done the contrary, so as to love the darkness and not the light. We must not understand

<sup>1</sup> ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.



the words comparatively, that they have loved the darkness above the Light; for they did not love the light at all, they hated it. That this is the right meaning is proved by what precedes. For He says that it was on this account that they loved the darkness rather than the light, because, doing evil, they hate the light. If they hate it, their love of the darkness is not merely comparative. So we must take 2 Tim. iii. 4, 'lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God', or Ps. lii. 5, 'thou hast loved wickedness rather than goodness'. (This love is exclusive, not comparative.)

**Dionysius** of Alexandria, Ecclesiastes (on ii. 13; Feltoe, p. 219). The one is to be chosen, the other shunned. 'More' ('rather')<sup>1</sup> refers to the choice of him who loves, not to the comparison of the things.

v. 20. **Origen**, John, Tome xx. 37 (29), p. 358. Since every one that doeth evil hateth the light, and cometh not to the light; but the light is He who said 'I am the Light of the world'; it is clear that by doing evil, dishonouring the light, he dishonours Christ.

Psalm xxxvi (xxxvii), Hom. i. 5, p. 659. As far as lies with him, hiding the evil things he does, and fearing lest he should be exposed, he veils and covers up his life.

Ephesians (Cramer's Catena: J. Th. St. iii. 561, on v. 8). From their fruits we shall recognize those who are light or darkness; for 'every one that doeth evil hateth the light', and, not coming to the light, is darkness and a son of darkness and night; but he who doeth the truth, coming to the light, is light and a son of light and of day.

<sup>1</sup> μάλλον.



## XXIV

## JOHN iii. 22-36

v. 23. Origen, Frag. 76, on John x. 39-40. Aenon is interpreted 'Eye of Trial',<sup>1</sup> and Salem 'He that ascendeth.' Already then are they more clear sighted who receive the second washing<sup>2</sup> and from much trial and labour have gained the eye of the soul. And it was right that the first baptism was by a *descent* ('Jordan'), the second by one ascending.

Tome x. 8 (6), p. 187. (Difficulty of harmonizing the Gospels, see on John ii. 12.)

vv. 26-28. Frag. 44. We must reasonably understand 'All men come' to mean 'many'. v. 27 means 'A man cannot have any divine gift<sup>3</sup> unless it has been given him from heaven. Now the gifts from God are given to those who are prepared by faith and virtue to receive them. Learn therefore that though I, receiving from the Son of God, have (power) to baptize through water unto repentance, I am far removed from Him who has given me this. And that I do not now say this for the first time, I have you as witnesses of what I said to those who asked if I was the Christ. For ye were present when I said that I am a forerunner of the Christ, but not the Christ Himself.'<sup>4</sup> But let no one stumble at 'A man can receive nothing' as though not rightly said.

Cyprian, Testimonies iii. 4. Heading 'That we should boast of nothing, since nothing is our own.'

Opinions of Bishops, 57. Julianus of Thelepte, 'If heresy is from heaven, it can also give baptism.'

<sup>1</sup> ὀφθαλμός βασάνου.

<sup>2</sup> αὐτὸς ἀναβαίνων.

<sup>3</sup> λουτρόν for MS λυτρόν.

<sup>4</sup> χάρισμα.

Testimonies ii. 19. Heading, 'That He is the Bridegroom with the Church as His Bride, from whom spiritual sons will be born.' (Cyprian reads 'that I said to those sent from Jerusalem to me.')

Origen, John, Frag. 45. 'The rational substance, a part of which is also the soul of man, is itself productive (generative) of no good things, although receptive of them. It therefore, like a woman, naturally generates from another the virtues, practical and contemplative, which it can bring forth. Therefore I will say it is the Bride, not of an ordinary being, but only of the Sower of good things. This is no other than Jesus, who ye have said is baptizing, to whom I bore witness, to whom ye say all are coming. Since then "all" includes you, if you want to produce good things, go ye away to Him. For ye are part of the Bride, being of the substance of the Rational. But if He is the Bridegroom, yet I, Being His friend, the minister of His purpose, have as my aim to present Him with those whom I am training. Therefore, though you have become my disciples, I am not the Bridegroom, that is, not the perfect Teacher. Therefore I exhort you while you have time to be joined to the perfect Teacher, to come to Him. Implanting in you longing for His society I say that I myself boast<sup>1</sup> of being His hearer; for I rejoice hearing his voice. Therefore also it is our joy when those who have previously been my companions receive such great intellectual training as to receive the wisdom taught by Him to those worthy of it. For ye know that He, coming from above, is above all, being King and Almighty. If He is above all, it is clear that He is also above

<sup>1</sup> εὐχομαι.

myself; whence it is right that He should increase, I decrease.'

(For the figure of Bride and Bridegroom, see 2 Cor. ii. 2; Eph. v. 32.)

John is the friend of Him who is meant by the Bridegroom, standing by Him with steadfast agreement by having firm faith in Him; and so standing he rejoices with joy because of the Bridegroom's speech. Whence he adds 'This my joy therefore is fulfilled, by all men going to Jesus. For I have come to witness to Him, that all through me may believe Him; wherefore he must increase, but I decrease.' We must attend to this intelligently, for the Saviour does not increase by receiving anything more, nor John decrease by casting anything off, for each remains the same. What is said is thus understood; the morning star rising before the sun has its greatness bounded by the accustomment of the eyes to encounter a still greater light. It appears greater, when the sight first encounters the sun; but gradually as the sun is manifested the morning star decreases, not casting off any of its own greatness, but compared with the manifestation of the sun's light. So also John is a great one by fulness of holiness. Jesus came after him, was baptized, received witness from him; but after this, the Godhead of Jesus being displayed, the one is proved to be servant, the other Master.

v. 30. **Clement**, Paed. I. vi. 28, 5. The Lord Himself revealed most clearly the equality of salvation, saying (vi. 40). . . . Faith is the perfection of learning.<sup>1</sup> Therefore He says 'Every one that believeth on the Son hath eternal life.' If then we who have believed have life, what remains beyond the possession of eternal life?

<sup>1</sup> μάθησις.



*v.* 30. Strom. VI. xi. 94, 6. The prophet John said 'I must decrease, but the Lord's word alone must henceforth increase, in whom the Law reaches its end.'

*vv.* 30-31. Tertullian, Baptism, 10. John the Baptist avows that the heavenly things are not his own, but Christ's, by saying 'He who is of the earth speaks of the earth; he who comes from above, is above all.'

*vv.* 31-32. Hippolytus, Noetus, 5. Quoted as parallel to i. 18, 'He who descended from heaven testifies about what He has seen and heard.'

Psalms, Frag. 11. Christ's word was always in harmony with the Father. (Quoted as above, except 'cometh' for 'descended'.)

Origen, John, Frag. 46. For if He comes from above and from the Father as Almighty, it is clear that He is above all. Those who have a material mind<sup>1</sup> bear the image of the earthy, who also speak of the earth. Wherefore if they ever profess teaching, they have the wisdom of which James writes, earthly, animal, demoniacal. Concerning such Isaiah also writes, as being of the earth and speaking from it, while the Word of God who comes from above is above all, and speaks what He has seen and heard. But the Prophets also, having the word from above coming to them, speak heavenly and divine things which they saw with their mind and heard with the ears of the inner man; for each of them will say 'Thus saith the Lord', and 'The Word of the Lord came to me, saying.' Solomon says more plainly 'My words are spoken by God'.<sup>2</sup> Wherefore it is written, Heb. i. 1. . . . What He has seen and heard He spoke by way of teaching to men. But this

<sup>1</sup> φρόνημα.

<sup>2</sup> Prov. xxiv. 69 LXX (= xxxi. 1).



agrees with the incarnation ; for it is not suitable to take these things of the Godhead.

Frag. 47. ' And no one receives His witness.' Yet many have received His witness, as again John adds, *v.* 33. How then, when some receive His witness, can it be true that no one receives it ? The solution is that Jesus, having come from above and speaking what He heard and saw, utters a most lofty and very great witness about the Father and Himself, and no one receives this witness as He Himself gives it, because the hearers, while beginning to receive it, are far removed from the greatness of the witness. Yet although no one is able to receive the witness thus, it is nevertheless possible to receive it in so far as it can be received by those now coming to faith. Hence ' He that has received His witness ' does not conflict with no one having received it, since some receive it not, but some others receive it, who also from having received the witness of Jesus seal with firm deposition that God is true, having learnt that He who was sent from Him speaks the words of God, since He is not of the earth nor speaks from it. For God gives not the Spirit by measure.

John, Tome xix. 20 (5), p. 302. He did not say that He who is from heaven is from heaven and speaks from heaven ; for perhaps the Saviour was not from heaven, specially as He was Firstborn of all creation. The Second Man was from heaven ; 1 Cor. xv. 47.

Romans, Book ii. 4, p. 478. (' He that is of the earth is like the Rich Fool, laying up treasure on earth '.)

John, Frag. 48. We will interpret ' No one receives His witness ' in another way also. For since he who searches the Scriptures finds them witnessing of Christ, but the Jews did not search them as they ought, none of

the Jews reading the Scriptures without examination received their witness concerning Him ; only every one who can say ' We have found Him of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, wrote, even Jesus ' receives the witness about Him and sets his seal that God is true, who has previously promised the Gospel through the Prophets in Holy Scripture concerning His Son.

**Novatian, Trinity, 14.** If Christ were only a man, how does He who came from heaven bear witness of what he has seen and heard, when it is clear that a man cannot come from heaven, because he cannot be born there ?

(None of these comments imply *ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν* in *v. 31c*, though it is read in Origen ; John, Tome xix. 20.)

*v. 34. Origen, Numbers, Hom. xxvii. 13, p. 384.* (Of progress.) God gives not the Spirit by measure ; but because the Lord is Spirit, He therefore breathes where He wills.

**John, Frag. 48.** For though wise men, having God, spoke the words of God, yet they had Spirit of God in part ;<sup>1</sup> He says ' I will pour out *of* My Spirit upon all flesh '. But the Saviour, sent in order to speak the words of God, does not give the Spirit in part ; for, not having Himself received it to bestow on others, but being sent from above and being above all, He gives it as its Fountain—head<sup>2</sup> . . . . But in other copies it runs ' For not in part<sup>3</sup> does He give the Spirit ', this Scripture also signifying that He who was sent has it not in measure so as to supply it sparingly, and in part, and to a few easily counted, but lavishing and richly to all who are found worthy of receiving it. (Probably

<sup>1</sup> ἐκ μέρους.

<sup>2</sup> πηγή.

<sup>3</sup> ἐκ μέρους.

ἐκ μέτρου should be read, Origen's primary reading being ἐκ μέρους.<sup>1</sup>)

Frag. 47. Since the heretics who pervert their own mind by means of all things, dividing the Godhead and therefore also the Scriptures, saying that the Old Testament belongs to one God whom they call the Creator of the world, and the New to another, whom they set down as the Father of Christ, say that John said of himself and the other prophets 'He that is of the earth speaketh from the earth;' but of Christ and His apostles 'He that cometh from heaven . . . for He whom God sent speaketh His words'; we must convict them of laying down this view in falsehood or rather in impiety. For the Baptist himself says of himself, i. 33-34. For if He who sent him to baptize is the Father, telling him of the descent of the Spirit and that the Christ is His Son, how does he speak from the earth, saying what he has heard from the Father of Christ? Also the evangelist writes i. 6-7. And if the prophets before John spoke from the earth, how do they testify of Christ, as the Saviour said of their writings, 'They are they who testify of Me'?

Romans, Book IV. 1, p. 523. God has not set a measure to His grace, since it is written 'For God gives not the Spirit by measure.'

Ephesians (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. iii. 413, on iv. 5.) For not by measure does God give the Spirit and the grace—God, of whose majesty there is no limit; but He gives *a* measure, sparing the receivers, each not holding more than he receives for his profit.

<sup>1</sup> Brooke takes the converse view. 'Εκ μέρους here, 'Εκ μέτρου above.



**Cyprian**, Epistle 64, 3. The Holy Spirit is furnished equally to all, not by measure, but by fatherly love and mercy.

69, 14. The Holy Spirit is not given by measure, but is poured entire (totus) on the believer.

**Novatian**, Trinity, 20. In the case of Moses the name of God was given moderately (partially), Exod. vii. 1; in the case of Christ, lavishly; in the former case by measure, in the latter altogether above all measure. For the Father giveth not, he says, to the Son by measure; for the Father loveth the Son. . . .

v. 35. **Origen**, John, Frag. 50. How would not God love, Who hates all evil! Isa. lxi. 8; He hates the forms of evil in which the sinner rejoices. He therefore loves the Son as bestowing virtue and destroying evil; therefore he says, 'the Father loveth the Son', being in turn loved by Him; 'love' again being said somewhat humanly, but not so understood. For if God, loving righteousness, does not love it in the same way as the righteous man does, because he has it in himself and has been made according to it; so He yearns for the Son who is Word and Truth and Wisdom and Sanctification. But the word may establish the close connection<sup>1</sup> of the Father with the Son. For it is a natural law for those who generate to love what they generate. And as with men their disposition<sup>2</sup> towards their children is a natural one, which takes a different form towards those who are otherwise loved, so also God loves the world as God, but loves the Son as Father. Therefore it is not said that '*God*' but '*The Father*' loves the Son and gives all things into His hand. This is to be taken faithfully and wisely. For if all things were made through Him,

<sup>1</sup> οἰκειότης.

<sup>2</sup> διάθεσις.



all things are actually under His hand as regards creation and providence ; but these things had fallen away through sin, so as to be outside His sheltering hand.<sup>1</sup> So with view to their salvation the Father gives them into the hand of the Son, bestowing no addition to the Son but betterment to them. For He gives them as to a teacher and physician, that having brought them clear of ignorance and disease, i. e. evil, He may keep them sheltered and ruled by Him, having them already under His active and providential hand. The truth of this thought is shown by the sequel. ' He that believeth the Son hath eternal life.' For if he who believes the Son, into whose hand he is given, has eternal life, he is given with view to his own salvation and betterment, but not so that the Son receives any advantage. But when is the gift of all things into the Son's hands completed, save when every knee shall bow to Him of things in heaven and on earth and under the earth ?

Frag. 51. In many places of the Scriptures the punishments against the bad are called the wrath of God, e. g. *Exod. xv. 7* ; *1 Thess. ii. 16* ; *Rom. ii. 5*. For it must not be considered that what is termed God's wrath is a passion in Him ; for how can there be a passion in the Impassible ? But since God being unchangeable has no passion, what is called His wrath must be interpreted as above.

**Tertullian**, *Praxeas*, 16. Do not think that only the works of the world were made through the Son, but also all things done henceforth by God. For the Father Who loves the Son, and has delivered all things into His hand, certainly loves Him from the beginning, and has delivered them from the beginning, when the Word was

<sup>1</sup> τῆς σκεπούσης αὐτὰ χειρός.

with God and was God. The Father judgeth no one, but has delivered all judgment to the Son—this is from the beginning, no time being excepted.

21. Distinction of Father and Son is shown by John, when some asked why Jesus baptized.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies, ii. 27. Heading, 'We cannot come to God the Father except through His Son, Jesus Christ.'

## XXV (A)

LUKE iii. 19-20 ; MATT. xiv. 3-5 ; MARK vi. 17-20

**Origen**, Luke, Hom. xxvii (with Greek fragments). Herod the tetrarch had royal power and could kill whom he would ; yet when he had done an unrighteous act, contrary to the Law of Moses, in taking his brother's wife; who had a daughter by her former husband, John did not fear him, did not accept his person, did not consider his royal power, did not fear death. . . . When shut up in prison he was not anxious about death or about the uncertainty of judgment, but was thinking of Christ whom he had proclaimed. Luke vii. 19. By Christ's word in reply John is armed for the fight and dies in confidence.

Matthew, Tome x. 21, p. 470f. Herod, having laid hold of John, bound him in prison and put him away, doing this as a sign, as far as rested with him and the wickedness of the people, of binding and shutting up the word of prophecy, and preventing it any longer remaining the herald of the truth at liberty as before. This Herod did 'because of Herodias his brother Philip's wife' ; for John kept saying to him, 'It is not lawful for thee to have her'. This Philip was the tetrarch of Ituraea and the region of Trachonitis. Some therefore think that on Philip's death leaving a daughter Herodias,

Herod married his brother's wife,<sup>1</sup> the Law allowing the marriage in case of childlessness. But as we cannot clearly find Philip to be dead, we consider Herod's offence to be all the greater, because he carried off the wife of his living brother.

Wherefore John, adorned with prophetic boldness of speech, and not fearing the royal dignity of Herod nor keeping silence over so great a sin from fear of death, said to Herod, filled with divine courage, 'It is not lawful for thee to have her; for it is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife'. Herod, having laid hold of John, bound him and put him away in prison, not daring to kill him outright and so take away the word of prophecy from the people.

(B)

MATT. iv. 12; MARK i. 14; LUKE iv. 14;  
JOHN iv. 1-3

John iv. 2. **Tertullian**, Baptism, 11. They say 'The Lord came and did not baptize—for He Himself baptized not, but His disciples'—as though John had declared that He would actually baptize with his own hands. He in whose service a thing is done is always said to do it, e. g. 'the emperor put forth an edict' or 'the prefect flogged a man'. So 'He will baptize' will have to be taken as 'through Him' or 'unto Him ye will be baptized'. But let it not trouble any that He did not Himself baptize. For into whom should He baptize? unto repentance? what then was the use of His fore-runner? unto remission of sins, which He was giving by

<sup>1</sup> Or 'leaving a daughter, Herod married Herodias his brother's wife'. . . . But see Mark vi. 22; and Origen just below says that the wife of the king of Trachonitis had a daughter of the same name.



a word? unto Himself, whom He was concealing by lowliness? unto the Holy Spirit, when He had not yet ascended to the Father? unto the Church, which the apostles had not yet established? Therefore His disciples baptized as His ministers, as John His forerunner, with the same baptism of John. . . . Christian baptism could not yet be given by them, as the Lord's glory was not yet completed, nor the value of Baptism established by the Passion and Resurrection, because our death could not be done away but by the Lord's Passion nor life be restored without His Resurrection.

**Origen**, John, Tome vi. 23, p. 125. Christ then does not baptize in water, but His disciples do so; He reserves for Himself to baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire.

X. 8 (6), p. 167. Jesus in John is known among the Pharisees as baptizing, baptizing in His disciples, doing this along with other special things; but Jesus in the Three baptizes in no way.

X. 8. (10), p. 168. Origen finds it impossible to reconcile the Johannine and Synoptic accounts, taken literally. Here Matthew says Jesus withdrew into Galilee, avoiding being put in prison; but John says nothing about the Baptist being put in prison.

Possinus' Catena on Matthew. Christ's withdrawal is according to His saying, 'If they persecute you in one city, flee unto another'. Also it was in order that He might bring the Gentiles to Him, and enlighten them with light of knowledge.

**Eusebius**. Church History, iii. 24. (The Synoptists begin their account of the Lord's ministry from the imprisonment of John the Baptist; John supplements this narrative by recording a good deal which took place before this imprisonment.)



Origen, Luke, Hom. xxxii. When He was about to contend with the devil in the Temptation, the Spirit is twice mentioned without any addition. But when He had overcome the three recorded temptations, notice the carefulness of the Scriptures concerning the Spirit. '*In the power*' (of the Spirit) is added because of the Athlete Who had overcome.

## XXVI

## JOHN iv. 4-42

Origen, Jeremiah, Hom. xviii. 4, p. 244. The same thing is to one man a surface spring, to another a deep well. But both may receive benefit from it. In this passage, John iv, the same thing is called a well <sup>1</sup> and a spring.<sup>2</sup>

John Frag. 52. Since He had a body in truth made up of what all human bodies are made up, necessarily His body is subject to the common sufferings ; I do not mean only wounds and the like, but also the wearinesses which come of very severe and constant movement. For in the time of noon, when the sun beats down, He in journeying experienced great weariness, the moisture of His body being drained by the burning heat. For it was the sixth hour of the day. Desiring to refresh His weariness He sat down at the spring existing at the above-mentioned estate of Joseph ; at the same time providing for the benefit of the woman who could come to draw water from the spring.

Galatians (Apology of Pamphilus), p. 690. What else does the fact that wearied by the toil and heat of His journey, He sits and rests by the well, and thirsts,

<sup>1</sup> φρέαρ.

<sup>2</sup> πηγή.

denote, but the weariness of His sinews and the drying up of the moisture of His body by the excessive heat of the sun? But that being engaged in better things, He put off His wish to drink, and did not drink, is not to be taken to mean that He did not suffer thirst.

7f. Romans, Book III. 7, p. 512. We have found the custom of one word in the same passage having various meanings, elsewhere in Scripture. In John iv. 35, 'harvest' twice named, refers in the one case to the material harvest, in the second to the spiritual. So in John iv. 7f, when the Saviour says to the Samaritan woman, 'Give me to drink' and again says upon her reply, 'If thou knowest who saith to thee, Give me to drink. . . ' (v. 10). Here 'drink' and 'water' are to be taken in the same passage now literally and now spiritually. So ix. 39, 'blind' and 'not see' are understood now corporeally, now spiritually.

Rufinus seems here to combine several Greek passages :—

(1) From Tome ix. on Rom. vii. 7, in Philocalia ix. 2 (Robinson 56) and Cramer's Catena (J. Th. St. xiv. 12), where however John iv. 35; ix. 39, alone are adduced;

(2) On vi. 8-10 (J. Th. St. xiii. 364) where iv. 7f and iv. 35, are dealt with;

(3) On iii. 21 (J. Th. St. xiii. 221), adducing iv. 35.

vv. 8-9. **Origen**, John, Frag. 53. Perhaps some one might enquire the reason why Jews have no dealings with Samaritans. This can be found in III and IV Kingdoms (1 and 2 Kings) and 2 Chronicles. For the Law having said 'Touch no unclean thing,' they did not venture to touch even the flesh of strangers, thinking to be defiled thereby. But perhaps one might say, objecting to 'For His disciples had gone away into the city, to buy food,' 'If in the wilderness He fed five thousand and four thousand, together with also a multitude of

women and a great number of children, once with five and once with seven loaves, what great thing would it have been for the disciples to have plenty of food without going into the city to buy it, Jesus supplying it by His own power?' It must be said in answer that Jesus, having become man, if as truly God He were working all things, would have been unknown to have become man; but if He did all things as man, His Godhead would have been overshadowed. Wherefore if there was need for working miracles, He fed many with little, not so much to satisfy them as to manifest His divine power; but when it was not very urgent to supply abundance of food from poor resources,<sup>1</sup> His disciples went away to buy bread. For if when Jesus did these things to display His manhood and to manifest His Godhead, many have stumbled at the Gospel, some laying down that He had become Man in appearance but not in truth, others supposing Him a mere Man; how much more, if nothing had been precisely done and written about manifesting His Godhead and Manhood, would those be likely to be deceived who do not carefully and wisely read the narrative of these things?

Tome xiii. 9, p. 219. ('For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans' is part of the woman's speech.) Perhaps this was not true; Jesus, as we have said above, Himself associates with Samaritans, in order to help them.

v. 10. Hippolytus, Heresies, v. 9 (4). Used by the *Naassenes*.

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration vi. 18, p. 293, on Zech. xiv. 8. This was the rational<sup>2</sup> and fresh<sup>3</sup> life-

<sup>1</sup> ἐξ ἀπόρων.

<sup>2</sup> λογικόν.

<sup>3</sup> πότιμον.



giving <sup>1</sup> and saving draught of Christ's teaching, of which He Himself spoke in the Gospel according to John to the Samaritan woman. 'If thou knewest who it is that saith. . . . Living water.'

So x. 7, p. 488.

10f. Origen, John, Tome xx. 41 (33), p. 363. It is not probable that the Samaritan woman answered Him about literal water, and asked Him for material water that she might no longer thirst nor come all the way to draw from the literal spring of Jacob.

12f. Tertullian, Marcion, iv. 35. The Samaritans always prided themselves on the mountains and wells of the fathers—John iv. 12, 20.

Origen, John, Frag. 54. The Samaritan woman was displaying the greatest zeal to exalt the things belonging to Samaritan opinion (or 'glory' <sup>2</sup>) above the customs and doctrines of the Jews. Therefore when the Saviour offered to supply living water, she said in reply 'Art thou greater than our father Jacob?' But the Saviour, knowing how to deal with all things wisely, understanding that to uplift the things of the Jews, and to say 'I am greater,' was at this point likely to astound the mind of the woman who as yet imagined nothing higher than material things, reserves this in silence, but expresses His mind more suitably through other words which can none the less establish this, while yet smooth to hear. For He does not Himself introduce the comparison and distinction in glory, but sends the woman to calculate the superiority of eminence from what would be said (v. 13). Observe the wisdom and the force of the words; 'shall thirst again,' needed no proof from any other quarter, for the woman was herself a

<sup>1</sup> ζωτικόν.

<sup>2</sup> δόξη.



self-summoned <sup>1</sup> witness. But 'shall never thirst' roused her up and introduced her to the greatness of the promise.<sup>2</sup> But through both He is leading her to attend to a more divine supposition<sup>3</sup> practically saying 'If thou holdest Jacob in greater honour and of wonderful achievement because he furnished you with water from which he who drinks returns again to the same thirst, whom ought you to reckon him to be who is able to furnish water which does not ease bodily thirst for a short time, but can count <sup>4</sup> to its drinker as a spring of everflowing water, and furnish streams of salvation, which water those who draw from them and bestow eternal life?' For as the water cures thirst and cleanses the outward defilement of the body, so also the spiritual <sup>5</sup> and heavenly streams of Jesus' teaching and the more divine conception of Him heal the thirst arising from unbelief and cleanse from defilements the soul which has been defiled by the pollution of sins and the darksome thought of impious opinions.

Frag. 55. Jacob's well is in allegory the Scripture of Moses, from which Jacob along with his sons spiritually drank, while the cattle which were Jacob's also drank of it. The cattle stand in allegory for those who have steadiness and gentleness without word (or 'reason' <sup>6</sup>), which are also to be said to be properly Jacob's flocks and herds.

Frag. 56. The Law given through Moses being therefore the water, how did Jesus say that he who drinks of it thirsts again? It must be said that the Law has been given to men, not for them always to live by it,

<sup>1</sup> αὐτόκλητον.

<sup>3</sup> ὑπόληψις.

<sup>5</sup> νοερά.

<sup>2</sup> Text is corrupt.

<sup>4</sup> χρηματίζει.

<sup>6</sup> τὸ εὐσταθὲς καὶ πρᾶον ἄνευ λόγου.

but only for a certain time ; so that the drinking from the interpreted well endures till the setting forth of a greater water. For the injunctions of the Law were laid down until the time of reformation. You will apply to this what is said in Isaiah (ix. 1, LXX. ' This first drink, do quickly '). For if there were no drinking after that, it would not be said ' Drink this first.' And since the Gospel succeeds the Law, he who drinks the teaching of the Law will thirst again, in order to drink also that of the Gospel ; but since the Gospel is without successor, he who drinks of it will never thirst any more. For ' Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away,' said Jesus. For He says that he who drinks this water acquires in himself a spring, not of common water, but of that which springs up to eternal life. This water springing up to life lifts up also to life him who has it as a spring in himself.

Tome xiii. 1, p. 212. This is the second answer of Jesus to the Samaritan woman, the first being *v.* 10. Now He speaks as urging her to ask for the living water : she receives His words and says ' Give me this water.' Perhaps there is here a lesson that no one receives a divine gift without asking for it. Ps. ii. 8 ; Matt. vii. 7-8. The Samaritan woman is persuaded to ask Jesus for water ; she is, I think, an image of the mind of heretics who concern themselves with the divine Scriptures, when she heard of the comparison of the two waters. And observe from her past experiences how, drinking from what she thought to be a deep well, she was not refreshed nor freed from thirst.

. . . There are two material meanings of the words ' thirst ' and ' hunger.' (1) In one sense we being emptied need nourishment, and long for it because of moisture failing us ; (2) In another sense those who are

poor and in want of necessities often say, even when filled, that they are hungry or thirsty. An instance of the first appears in Exod. xvi. 1-4, and in the case of thirst, Exod. xv. 24f; xvii. 1f. An instance of the second will appear to occur 1 Cor. iv. 11. The first hungering and thirsting necessarily occurs to healthy bodies, the second befalls those who are poor. Which is meant here?

First, in a bodily sense, perhaps what is meant is that even if he be satisfied for the present, yet straightway on his drink having been absorbed the drinker will experience the same sufferings,<sup>1</sup> i.e., will again thirst, brought again to a similar position as originally. He adds therefore the promise to him who will drink of the water which He will give. . . . Who, having a spring within himself, will be liable to thirst?

What however is principally meant may be of this sort: 'He who partakes of depth of words, though for a little while refreshed by having accepted as very deep the thoughts which are drawn up and apparently found, yet again on considering a second time will be in doubt about the things by which he was refreshed, since what was regarded by him as depth cannot furnish clear and distinct<sup>2</sup> comprehension of the thing sought. Therefore although he may be carried away so as to acquiesce in the persuasiveness of what is said, yet he will afterwards find in himself the same want as he had before learning things of this kind. But I have such a word as to become the spring of living drink in him who has received My message. And so greatly will he who has taken of My water be profited, that there will spring up in him a spring which solves all questions, of

<sup>1</sup> πάθος.

<sup>2</sup> ἔκτυπον.



waters leaping upwards ; his mind leaping and flying quickly . . . and his leaping bearing him upwards, to eternal life '. . . . Perhaps also it will leap after eternal life to the Father who is above eternal life ; for Christ is the Life, but He who is greater than Christ is greater than life.

Then, when the promise of the Beatitude (Matt. v. 6, q. v.) is fulfilled, will he who has drunk of the water which Jesus will give have the spring of water springing up to eternal life, which spring has come to be in him.

That we may therefore thirst (in order to be filled) it is good to drink first of Jacob's *spring*, not calling it, like the Samaritan woman, a *well*. The Saviour does not even now in answer to her say that the water is from a well, but simply ' Every one that drinketh of this water shall thirst again.' But if there had been no profit from drinking of the spring, Jesus would not be sitting by the spring, nor say to the Samaritan woman ' Give Me to drink.' We must then notice that even when the Samaritan woman asked Jesus for the water, He as good as promised to furnish it in no other place than by the spring, saying . . . ' Come hither.'

Some of the more excellent and divine of God's mysteries have not been contained in Scripture, some not even in human speech (cp. John xxi. 25 ; Apoc. x. 4 ; 2 Cor. xii. 4). I think that the whole of the Scriptures even though most accurately understood, are some very small rudiments of the whole of knowledge and very slight introductions to it. See then whether Jacob's spring, of which Jacob once drank but now no longer drinks, and his sons once drank, but now have a better drink than this, and his cattle have drunk—is the whole of Scripture, but Jesus' water is above what is written. . . . The things which have not come up into man's



heart are greater than Jacob's spring ; they are manifested from the spring of water leaping up to eternal life, to those who have no longer a man's heart but can say ' We have the mind of Christ, that we may know the things freely given us by God, which also we speak not in words taught of human wisdom but in those taught by the Spirit.' Consider whether we can give the name of ' human wisdom ' not to false doctrines but to the rudiments of the truth which come to those who are still men ; but the things taught of the Spirit are perhaps the spring of water leaping up to eternal life. But every one does not draw from Jacob's spring in a like manner . . . perhaps Jacob and his sons drank in one way, intelligently ; his cattle in another, more simply and as cattle ; the Samaritan woman in yet another way. For those who are wise according to the Scriptures drink like Jacob and his sons ; the simpler ones, who are called Christ's sheep, drink like Jacob's cattle ; but those who pervert the Scriptures and set up blasphemies under pretence of having understood them, drink as the Samaritan woman drank before she believed in Jesus.

Prayer 30, p. 266. Those who by the shield of faith quench all the fiery darts cast upon them by the Evil One are not set on fire, since they have in themselves rivers of water springing up to eternal life ; they destroy the power of the Evil One by a flood of divine and saving thoughts.

Celsus, vi. 20, p. 645. We hope . . . having received springs of water leaping up to eternal life according to Jesus' teaching, and having enjoyed rivers of contemplations, to be hereafter with what are called ' the waters above the heavens, praising the name of the Lord.'

Genesis, Hom. vii. 5, p. 80. The Church drinks of

the springs of the Gospels and Apostles, which never fail. . . . It drinks also of the wells when it draws and searches out every deeper thing from the Law. Through this mystery I think our Lord and Saviour said to the Samaritan woman, John iv. 13-14. She replied, *v.* 15. After this the Lord said to her, 'He who believes on Me, there shall be in Him a spring of water leaping up to eternal life.'

Jeremiah, Frag. 22 (on xxiv. 1). Another has in him rivers springing to eternal life, if he has most refreshing <sup>1</sup> words.

Matthew, Tome xii. 8, p. 521. (Need to allegorize—otherwise, the Samaritan woman will seem to have thought that the Saviour was making a promise about natural <sup>2</sup> water.)

Hippolytus, Heresies, v. 27 (22). Used by Justin the Gnostic.

Irenæus, III. xviii. 1, H.; III. xvii. 2, p. 208, M. We, being originally a dry tree, would never bear fruit of life, without a gracious rain from above. For our bodies have received union unto incorruption through washing, our souls through the Spirit. Hence both are necessary, since both profit us for the life of God. Our Lord shows mercy on the sinful Samaritan woman, who did not continue with one husband, but had committed fornication in many marriages; and shows her and promises her the living water, that she may thirst no longer, nor be engaged in drawing of water won by toil, having in herself a drink springing up to eternal life, which the Lord receiving as a gift from the Father, Himself also bestowed on those who partake of Him, sending into the whole world the Holy Spirit.

<sup>1</sup> ποτιμωτάτους.

<sup>2</sup> αἰσθητοῦ.

**Cyprian**, Epistle lxiii. 8. By this the Baptism of saving water is signified, which is once received and not again repeated. But (*ceterum*) the cup of the Lord in the Church is always thirsted for and drunk.

**Eusebius**, Prophetic Selections, iv. 16. The spring of the living water of the words of Jesus, springing up to eternal life.

Isaiah, on iii. 1.

v. 15f. **Origen**, John, Tome xiii. 7, p. 217. Now for the second time the Samaritan woman addresses the Saviour as 'Lord',<sup>1</sup> the first time being v. 11. . . . Since it is truly said that 'thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water,' it is clear that she who said 'Give me this water' received the living water, that she might no longer be distressed by thirst nor come all the way to Jacob's spring in order to draw, but might be able apart from Jacob's water to contemplate the truth even as angels do, beyond man's power. For neither do the angels need Jacob's spring in order to drink, but each has in himself a spring of water leaping up to eternal life, produced and revealed by the Word and Wisdom Himself. Nevertheless it is not possible for any man to receive the other water besides that from Jacob's spring, viz. that given by the Word, if he has not been most diligently occupied by reason of his thirsting, in coming and drawing from thence; so that in respect of this many things are lacking to most people, who have not generally been trained by drawing from Jacob's spring.

We said above that the husband is the Law ruling over the soul, to which each has subjected himself. Cp. Rom. vii. 1f, where 'the Law' is the subject of

<sup>1</sup> κύριε.



‘liveth’; *2a* means ‘to her living husband, which husband is the Law’. . . . The Law according to the letter is dead, and the soul is not an adulteress by becoming joined to another husband, the Law according to the Spirit. . . . If then the husband is a Law, and the Samaritan woman has some husband, by having subjected herself by the perversion of sound words to some law, according to which each of the heterodox chooses to live; the divine Word here wants the heterodox soul to be convicted by setting forth the law that rules her, so that having despised it as no lawful husband she may seek another husband, so as to become another’s, even the Word who will rise from the dead . . . everlastingly abiding and reigning, and subduing all His enemies, Rom vi. 9f. But where else ought he who was regarded as the Samaritan woman’s husband to have been exposed as no husband, save at Jacob’s spring by Jesus, if the woman had not herself denied the husband? Therefore Jesus says to her, ‘Go, call thy husband and come hither.’ But she, as though having already some of the water springing to eternal life, because of having said, ‘Give me this water,’ and because he who had previously promised ‘Thou wouldst have asked of him and he would have given thee living water,’ cannot lie, answered condemning herself for associating with such a husband and said ‘I have no husband.’

*v.* 17f. 9, p. 219. I think that every soul, introduced into Christ’s religion which is through the Scriptures, starting with sensible and material things, has the five husbands, one husband answering to each of the senses; but whenever any one after having associated with things of sense, wishing to look up and turning to spiritual things, falls in with an unsound speech



pretending to allegory and spiritual things, he comes unto another after the five husbands, having given so to speak a bill of divorce to the former five and deciding to associate with the sixth. And until Jesus comes and brings us to the consciousness of such a husband we associate with him ; but on the Lord the Word coming and conversing with us, we deny that husband and say ' I have no husband ; ' when indeed the Lord praises us saying ' Thou hast well said, " I have no husband." ' But ' This thou hast said true ' is as it were by way of exposure that the things she had previously said were not true. And perhaps ' For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans ' was not true ; Jesus Himself has dealings with Samaritans in order to help them also. And ' Thou hast nothing to draw with and the well is deep ' was not true. And perhaps it was not true that ' Jacob drank of the well, and his sons and his cattle ; ' for if Jacob and his sons and his cattle did not drink in a similar way to the Samaritan woman, but she thought it the same way and the same drink, it is clear that she spoke falsely.

**Heracleon** says that that life and the glory according to it had been feeble <sup>1</sup> and temporary and failing ; for it was a worldly one ; and he thinks to bring proof of its being worldly from the fact that Jacob's cattle had drunk of it. We should not have blamed this if he were taking partial knowledge to be feeble and temporary and failing, whether the knowledge which comes from the Scriptures compared with the unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter, or all present knowledge which comes ' through a glass darkly ' which is done away when what is perfect comes ; but if he

<sup>1</sup> ἄτονον.

does so in order to malign what is ancient, he must be blamed. But he speaks the truth in saying that 'the water which the Saviour gives is from the Spirit and His power.' And on 'shall thirst no more for ever' he has expressed himself thus, 'For his life is eternal and never decaying, like the former which came from the well, but abiding; for the grace and the gift of our Saviour is inalienable<sup>1</sup> and not consuming nor decaying in him who partakes of it.' But in granting the first life to be one that decays, if he were meaning that which is according to the letter, seeking and finding that which comes by the removal of the veil, according to the Spirit, he would be speaking soundly; but if he is bringing an absolute charge of decay against what is ancient, it is clear that he is doing this because not seeing that these good things have a shadow of those to come. His exposition of 'springing up' is attractive—that those who participate in what is supplied richly from above, themselves also gush forth<sup>2</sup> what has been supplied to them, unto the eternal life of others. But he also praises the Samaritan woman as having displayed the undoubting faith which corresponds to her nature, by her feeling no doubt about His words to her. If He were simply accepting her attitude<sup>3</sup> without any implication of the excellence of her nature, we also would agree; but if he refers the cause of her assent to her natural constitution, as though this were not present in all, his statement is to be rejected. But somehow Heraclion accepting what is not written says on 'Give me this water,' that being somewhat pricked by the Word she henceforth hated even the place of that which was called 'living water.' Moreover, on 'Give me this

<sup>1</sup> ἀναφαίρετος.<sup>2</sup> ἐκβλύσαι.<sup>3</sup> προαίρεσιν.

water, that I thirst not . . . ' he says that the woman says this, expressing the laboriousness and difficulty of attainment and lack of nourishment in that water. For whence can he show that Jacob's water does not nourish ?

Further, Heracleon on ' He saith to her ' says ' It is clear that He means something of this kind, " If thou wishest to receive this water go, call thy husband " ' ; and he thinks that he whom the Saviour called the Samaritan woman's husband was her Pleroma, that coming with him to the Saviour she might be able to receive from Him the power and the union and the mixture with her Pleroma, for in bidding her to call her husband he did not mean one of this world, since he was not ignorant that she had no lawful husband. But here he is clearly giving a forced construction, in saying that the Saviour meant her consort from the Pleroma ; for if this were so He ought to have said also how the husband was to be called, that he might come with her to the Saviour. But since, as Heracleon says, in the spiritual sense <sup>1</sup> she did not know her own husband, but in the simple sense she was ashamed to say she had a paramour and no husband, will he not be enjoining in vain who says ' Go, call thy husband and come hither ? ' Next, on ' Thou hast well said, I have no husband,' he says ' Since in the world the Samaritan woman had no husband, for her husband was in the aeon.' We have read ' Thou hast had five husbands,' but we have found in Heracleon ' Thou hast had six husbands.' His interpretation is that all material evil is meant by the six husbands ; in this she had been involved and was associating contrary to reason, fornicating and insulted

<sup>1</sup> τὸ νοούμενον.



and rejected and forsaken by them. But we must say to him that if she who was spiritual used to commit fornication, then she who was spiritual used to sin ; but if she who was spiritual sinned, she, the spiritual, was not a good tree ; for according to the Gospel, ' A good tree cannot bear evil fruits.' It is clear that their mythology is done for.<sup>1</sup> But if it is impossible for the good tree to bear evil fruits, and the Samaritan woman was a good tree, being spiritual, it remains for him to say that either her fornication was not sin, or *she* did not commit fornication.

Frag. 57. The woman having said that she wanted to receive water from Jesus, to quench her thirst, by having it as a spring in herself, makes it clear that she wanted it. For by this saying she confessed that there was much toil in drawing the former water ; herein she said the truth, for indeed the keeping of the Law according to the letter involves much toil. But the Saviour probably says to her ' Since thou art still concerned with the Law which thou hast set up for thyself, associating with it as a husband, go and call it so as to compare the things written in it with the things said and done by Me. For so thou wilt be able to find that he who drinks from the former water will look for another because he will thirst again.' But on her denial, that she had a husband the Saviour, gently rebuking her Samaritan mind, says, ' Thou dost well say thou hast no husband.' For she did not wholly agree with the whole Old Covenant, which is the Law, of which it is written ' Christ is the end of the Law unto righteousness.' ' But not having this husband, thou hadst five, assenting only to the outward<sup>2</sup> things of Scripture.

<sup>1</sup> οἴχεται.

<sup>2</sup> αἰσθητοῖς.



For if thou wast living with the whole Old Covenant, thou wouldst have been able to recognize God the Word looked for after the Law and Prophets.' 'Thou hadst five husbands' is to be referred to the Five Books of Moses; for the Samaritans receive these only. But who is the sixth whom she has besides the five husbands, who is actually not her husband? We must say the account of his being a prophet. For she had already agreed to this, constrained by what is said; but not in true agreement. Wherefore it is fitly said 'And now whom thou hast is not thy husband; for thou hast not genuinely come to him.' But since her five husbands were also said to be the things of sense, after which she had agreed, though not exactly, with some spiritual word from Jesus' instruction, it is said most exactly<sup>1</sup> 'And he whom thou now seemest to have, the spiritual word, is not thy husband.'

**Tertullian**, Single Marriage, 8. He denies the Samaritan woman a husband that He may show more than one husband (*numerosum maritum*) to be an adulterer.

v. 19f. **Origen**, John, Tome xiii. 12, p. 222. The Samaritan woman now for the third time addresses our Saviour as 'Lord,'<sup>2</sup> this is the last time she is recorded to have spoken so to Him; but she does not yet think Him to be greater than the prophets, nor Him of whom they prophesied, but only some prophet. And the heterodox mind of those who are occupied about the Scriptures, after the exposure of its five former husbands and its reputed husband after they had been abandoned by it, being unable to see at first what the exposing Word is, says that He is a prophet, as being someone divine and having something

<sup>1</sup> εὐθυβολώτατα.

<sup>2</sup> κύριος.

superhuman, but not so great as He actually is. Therefore she says as if looking up and regarding herself to have been in contemplation, ' I observe <sup>1</sup> that Thou art a Prophet '. As regards ' Our fathers, ' etc., we must know the difference of the Samaritans with the Jews about the place they regard as holy ; for the Samaritans regarding the mountain called Gerizim as holy, worshipped God there ; Moses mentions it, Deut. xxvii. 11f. . . . But the Jews having regarded Zion as divine and specially belonging to God, think it to be the place chosen by the Father of all, and say that therefore in it was built the Temple by Solomon, and the whole service of Priests and Levites is performed there. According to these suppositions each nation has considered that the fathers worshipped God in this or that mountain.

And if even to this day Samaritans and Jews should condescend to speak to one another, each will still raise this difficulty. But since the Jews, for salvation is from them, are figures of those who hold sound principles, but the Samaritans of the heterodox, accordingly the Samaritans hallow Gerizim, which is interpreted ' Severance ' or ' Division ' ; the historical severance and division of the ten tribes from the others took place in the times of Jeroboam, who also himself is interpreted ' Cleavage of the People '. <sup>2</sup> But the Jews hallow Zion, which is a Watchtower. <sup>3</sup> Origen discusses why the blessings with Moses take place on Gerizim. In so far then as the hour spoken of by the Lord has not yet come, when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem will they worship the Father, we must shun the mountain of the Samaritans and worship God in Zion, where is

<sup>1</sup> θεωρῶ.

<sup>2</sup> Διχασμὸς Λαοῦ.

<sup>3</sup> Σκοπευτήριον.

Jerusalem, which Christ calls 'the City of the great King,' i.e. the Church built of living stones, wherein is a holy priesthood, and spiritual sacrifices are offered to God by the spiritual who have understood the spiritual law.

'The hour cometh' is written twice, but only in the second case does the evangelist add 'and now is'. I think the first denotes the worship outside the body which will come in the perfect state; but the second the progress of those in this life who are being perfected as far as human nature allows. It is therefore possible to worship the Father in the spirit and in truth when the hour not only cometh but even now is, although we may be thought to be in Jerusalem because of those who have only come so far. When indeed it is written 'The hour cometh and now is' it is no longer said 'Neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem will ye worship the Father', as is said when 'the hour cometh' is written without the 'now is'.

**Heracleon** says that the Samaritan woman admitted in an honourable manner what He said to her; for 'it is the part of a prophet alone to know all things.' In both points he speaks falsely, for angels also can know such things, and the prophet does not know all things, 'for we know in part and we prophesy in part.' But after this he praises the Samaritan for having acted in a way becoming her nature, neither having spoken falsely nor having downright admitted her own shame; she being persuaded that He was a prophet, asked Him a question while at the same time expressing the cause of her fornication, viz. that by ignorance of God she had neglected also worship according to God's mind, and all the things necessary to her in life . . . else, he says, she would not be coming to the well lying outside the city.



But I do not know how he considered the cause of her fornication to be expressed, or that ignorance had been the cause of her faults even as regards worship according to God; but he seems to have conjectured these things at random without any persuasiveness. And he adds that she, wanting to learn *how*, and by pleasing and worshipping *what* God she might be delivered from fornicating, says 'Our fathers worshipped in this mountain,' etc. But where does he get this?

(Tertullian, Marcion iv. 35—see on *v.* 12.)

*v.* 21f. Hippolytus, Heresies v. 4 (9). Used by the Naassenes (Phrygians).

Origen, First Principles, I. i. 4, p. 50. When, to whom, and in answer to what enquiry did our Saviour say that God is a spirit? To the Samaritan woman, who thought that God ought to be worshipped on Mount Gerizim according to the Samaritan view. For she was asking Him, thinking Him to be one of the Jews, whether one ought to worship God in Jerusalem or 'on this mountain.' Therefore to the view of the Samaritan woman, who thought that, according to the privilege of material places, God would be worshipped either rightly or less rightly either by the Jews in Jerusalem or by the Samaritans on Mount Gerizim, the Saviour answered that he who wanted to follow God must abandon this preference<sup>1</sup> of material places, and says *vv.* 21, 24. Notice how naturally he associated 'truth' with 'spirit,' so as to name spirit in distinction from bodies, truth in distinction from shadow or image. For those who worshipped in Jerusalem, serving an example and shadow of heavenly things, did not worship God in spirit and in truth; so with those who worshipped on Mount Gerizim.

<sup>1</sup> Praesumptio.



Celsus, vi. 70, p. 686. By this He taught that one ought not to worship God in flesh and fleshly sacrifices but in spirit. For He Himself also is to be thought Spirit analogous to His being worshipped in spirit and in truth. Moreover the Father ought not to be worshipped in figures (types) but in truth, which came through Jesus Christ, after the Law was given through Moses.

Genesis, Hom. xiii. 3, p. 95. Now is the time when true worshippers worship the Father neither in Jerusalem nor on Mount Gerizim, but in spirit and in truth. Not then in any place, nor in the earth, does God dwell, but in the heart. A clean heart is His place. See then that perhaps even in every one of us the soul is a well of living water,—there is some heavenly thought and hidden image of God.

John, Tome i. 6, p. 9. Every one therefore to whom Christ has come <sup>1</sup> worships God neither in Jerusalem nor on the mountain of the Samaritans, but having learnt that God is a spirit serving Him spiritually, worships in spirit and in truth but no longer in figure <sup>2</sup> the Father and Creator of all.

xiii. 16, p. 225. **Heracleon** seemed to have observed most persuasively here that in the former cases it was not said to her 'Believe me, woman' but now this is enjoined her. But he has then obscured <sup>3</sup> this attractive observation, by saying that by 'mountain' is meant the devil or his world, since the devil was one portion of the whole of matter, and the world the whole mountain of evil, a desolate habitation of wild beasts, which was worshipped by all those before the Law and by the heathen; but Jerusalem is the creation or the

<sup>1</sup> ἐπιδεδήμηκεν.

<sup>2</sup> τυπικῶς.

<sup>3</sup> ἐπεθόλωσε.

Creator' whom the Jews worshipped. But also secondly he supposed the mountain to be the creation which the heathen worshipped, but Jerusalem the creator whom the Jews served. Ye then, says he, as the spiritual, will worship neither the creation nor the creator,<sup>2</sup> but the Father of truth; and He includes her, says he, as already a believer<sup>3</sup> and numbered with the worshippers according to the truth. But we suppose that by 'neither in this mountain' is signified what is named religion among the heterodox, consisting in pomp of gnostic teachings which are supposed to be elevated; but by 'nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father' is meant the standard<sup>4</sup> with the most part of the Church, which the perfect and holy man will surpass, worshipping the Father more thoughtfully<sup>5</sup> and clearly and divinely. For just as, as even the Jews would admit, the angels do not worship the Father in Jerusalem, because they worship the Father better than in Jerusalem; so those who in disposition have already obtained equality with angels also do not in Jerusalem worship the Father, but in a better way than those in Jerusalem, though they may accommodate themselves for the sake of those in Jerusalem, 'becoming Jews that they may gain Jews.' But let 'Jerusalem' and 'the Jews' be understood as we have previously laid down. But when any one worships neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem, on the coming of the hour he having become a son worships the Father with confidence. Therefore it is not said 'nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship God,' but 'shall ye worship the Father'.

v. 22. 'Ye' means literally, the Samaritans; allegori-

<sup>1</sup> κτίστης.

<sup>4</sup> κανόνα.

<sup>2</sup> δημιουργός.

<sup>3</sup> πιστή.

<sup>5</sup> θεωρητικώτεροι.

cally, those heterodox as regards the Scriptures. 'We' means, literally, the Jews; allegorically, I the Word and those formed according to Me, having salvation from the words of the Jews; for the mystery now manifested has been manifested both through the prophetic Scriptures and the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. But see if it is not peculiarly and contrary to the sequence of the words that Heracleon has expounded 'Ye' to mean 'Jews and gentiles.'<sup>1</sup> How can it be said to the Samaritan woman 'you Jews' or 'you Gentiles'?

But the heterodox know not what they worship, because it is a fiction and not truth, and a myth and no mysteries;<sup>2</sup> but he who worships the Creator, especially in the way of the hidden Jew and the spiritual Jewish principles,<sup>3</sup> knows what he worships.

**Heracleon** quotes the book entitled '*The Preaching of Peter*' where Peter says that we should not worship according to the Greeks . . . nor yet according to the Jews. . . . It would take too long to examine the authority of this book. But we must enquire to whom bodily worship is rendered by the Jews; for it is clear that it was set before them to offer sacrifices to the Creator of all things. But see Acts vii. 42. I do not know how it is that while the Saviour directly says 'Salvation is of the Jews' the heterodox deny the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the fathers of the Jews. Further, if the Saviour fulfils the Law, and this and that thing takes place during the Lord's Advent that the things written in the prophets may be fulfilled, is it not clear in what way salvation comes from the Jews? For the same God is God of Jews and Gentiles: Rom. iii. 29-31.

<sup>1</sup> ἔθνικοί.

<sup>2</sup> μῦθος καὶ οὐ μυστήρια.

<sup>3</sup> λόγους.



**Frag. 58.** When you hear that salvation is from the Jews, hear what is said of Him who says this. For He was the Expectation of the nations, who came of the seed of David according to the flesh.

*vv. 23-24.* Tome xiii. 18, p. 228. Those who do not at all profess to worship the Father ought not even to be named worshippers of God; but of all professing to worship the Creator, if some are no longer in flesh but in spirit, by walking by the Spirit and not fulfilling the lust of the flesh, while others are not in spirit but in flesh and war according to flesh, it must then be said that the true worshippers are those who worship the Father in spirit and not flesh, and in truth and not figures, but that those who are not such are not true worshippers. And he who is enslaved to the letter that kills, but has not partaken of the Spirit that gives life, nor follows the spiritual things of the Law, he would be he who is no true worshipper, and does not worship the Father in spirit. This same man being altogether concerned with figures and corporeal things, even at his best worships God in figure and not in truth, and therefore cannot be called a true worshipper. Perhaps it has been sometimes reasonably granted that even the true worshipper worshipping in spirit and truth may do some figurative things, that having by his policy freed from figures those enslaved to the figure, he may bring them to the truth; so Paul in the case of Timothy, perhaps also at Kenchreae and Jerusalem. But it must be observed that the true worshippers not only in the coming hour, but in the present, worship the Father in spirit and truth; but they . . . worship at present in an earnest of the Spirit, but will worship the Father in spirit when they will receive the whole Spirit. But if he who sees in a mirror does not see what is true, as experts



say, but Paul and those like him see now in a mirror, it is clear that as he sees so also he worships God, and worships God in a mirror; but when the hour which will follow the present one has come, then will be the worship in truth, which is contemplated face to face and no longer in a mirror.

**Heracleon** thinks 'we worship' to refer to him who is in the *aeon* and those who have come with him; for these knew whom they worship, worshipping in truth. He also thus interprets 'Salvation is from the Jews'—'Since it came to pass in Judæa but not in them, for He had not pleasure in them all; and because from that nation went forth salvation and the word into the world.' In the allegorical sense <sup>1</sup> he explains salvation to have come from the Jews since they are thought by him to be images of those in the Pleroma.

But he and his followers ought to have shown how each of the things in their worship is an image of those in the Pleroma.

He says that the former worshippers worshipped, in flesh and error, him who was not the Father, so that all those who have worshipped the Creator (Demiurge) have erred in this same way. And Heracleon adds that they worshipped the creation and not the true Creator,<sup>2</sup> who is Christ, since 'All things were made through Him, and apart from Him was nothing made.'

If the Father seeks, He seeks through the Son who has come to seek and save the lost, whomsoever He, by cleansing and training by the word and sound doctrines, renders true worshippers. But *Heracleon* says that what belonged to <sup>3</sup> the Father was lost in the deep matter of error; it is sought that the Father may

<sup>1</sup> τὸ νοούμενον.

<sup>2</sup> κτίστης.

<sup>3</sup> τὸ οἶκεῖον.

be worshipped by His own. If then He was looking at the account of the loss of the sheep and of the son who fell away from his Father's house, we might have accepted his explanation. But those who follow his opinion make up stories and present something or other about the lost spiritual nature. . . .

v. 24. Many have declared much about God and His essence; some have said that he also is of 'corporeal nature, light and ethereal;' others, of incorporeal, and others, beyond these things in dignity and power of essence. It is then worth our while to see whether we have any basis from the divine Scriptures in order to say anything about God's essence. For here it is said as if His essence were the spirit, 'For God is spirit'; but in the Law, fire, 'For our God is a consuming fire'; and in John, light, 'For God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.' If then we understand these things simply, troubling about nothing beyond the letter, it is high time <sup>1</sup> for us to say that God is a body; but it does not belong to most people to know what strange things follow our saying this, for few have comprehension of the nature of bodies, especially of those furnished by reason and providence. . . . But if every material body has a nature without qualities in itself, but changeable and variable in all points, and admitting whatsoever qualities the Creator may choose to impose upon it, it is necessary that God also, being material, should be changeable and mutable and variable. And they are not ashamed to say that God is destructible,<sup>2</sup> being a body, though a spiritual and ethereal one, specially in respect of His mind (ruling principle <sup>3</sup>); but they say that while destructible He is not destroyed because there is no one

<sup>1</sup> ὥρα.

<sup>2</sup> φθαρτός.

<sup>3</sup> ἡγεμονικόν.

who destroys Him. But because of our not seeing what follows from our calling Him a body, and, because of Scripture, a body of such a character,—spirit, and consuming fire, and light—by not accepting the necessary consequence of those things, we shall be put to shame as foolish and speaking contrary to clear facts. For every fire needing nourishment is subject to decay, and every spirit—if we take spirit simply, being actually a body—admits as far as its own nature goes a change to what is grosser. It is then high time in this matter, either, keeping the letter, to accept such monstrous and dishonourable things about God, or to inspect, as we do in many other cases, and examine what can be meant by God being called spirit (breath) or fire or light.

(It is difficult to render *πνεῦμα* in this passage. Perhaps ‘breath’ would be better than ‘spirit.’)

First it must be said that as, when we find written, eyes, eyelids, ears, hands, feet and even wings of God, we turn what is written into allegory, disregarding those who ascribe to God a form similar to men, and we do this with reason; so we must do in the case of the above-mentioned names. God is there named ‘light’ by a transference from the corporeal light to an invisible and incorporeal light, because of His power in enlightening spiritual eyes; and He is termed ‘consuming fire’ by a transference from corporeal fire which consumes such matter. ‘God is a spirit’ appears to be a similar case; for since as regards what is ordinarily meant by ‘life,’ we are quickened by the Spirit, the Spirit (wind) which is around us breathing what is called more corporeally the breath of life; I suppose it has been taken from this that God leading us to the true life is called the Spirit; for the spirit according to Scripture is said to give life, clearly not ordinary life giving, but more divine; for also the



letter kills and imposes death, not that which consists in separation of soul from body, but that which consists in the separation of the soul from God, and the Lord, and the Holy Spirit. (So we may take spiritually Ps. civ. 29f; Gen. ii. 7; cp. also 1 Kings xix. 11f). . . .

Let us by the revelation of the Son come to know how God is Spirit, and give diligence to worship God in the spirit that quickens and not in the letter that kills, and to reverence Him in truth and no longer with figures or shadows and examples; just as the angels too do not like man serve God in examples and shadow, but in spiritual and heavenly things.

On 'God is Spirit' Heracleon says 'For undefiled and pure and invisible is His divine nature.' Thinking to make clear that the worshippers ought to worship in spirit and in truth, he says 'Worthily of Him who is worshipped spiritually, not carnally; for they themselves also are spirit, being of the same nature <sup>1</sup> as the Father, who worship after truth and not after error, as also the apostle teaches, calling such worship a reasonable service.' But let us consider if it is not exceedingly impious to say that of the same essence as the unbegotten and all-blessed nature are those who worship God in spirit, whom shortly before Heracleon himself said to have fallen away, saying that the Samaritan woman, of spiritual nature, had committed fornication. . . . But we, believing the Saviour who says 'My Father who sent Me is greater than I,' and who therefore did not endure to receive even the proper and true and perfect title of 'Good' when offered Him, but referred it thankfully to the Father, along with a reproof to Him who sought to overglorify the Son, say that the Saviour

<sup>1</sup> τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως.



and the Holy Spirit surpass all created things not comparatively but by exceeding superiority ; but He is as much or more surpassed by the Father as He and the Holy Spirit surpass the rest, though themselves not common beings, e.g. thrones, dominions. . . . Yet while superior to such great Beings in essence and dignity and power and divinity, for He is the living Word and Wisdom, He is in no respect comparable with the Father. For He is the Image of His goodness, and the Effulgence not of God but of His glory and of His everlasting light, and a Breath not of the Father but of His power, and a pure Effluence of His almighty glory, and an unspotted Mirror of His operation, by which Mirror Peter and Paul and those like them see God. He says 'He who has seen Me has seen the Father who sent Me.'

First Principles, I. i. 2, pp. 49-50. Some argue from this verse and Deut. iv. 24, that God is a body. . . . But Scripture is wont to give the name of 'Spirit' to anything opposed to this grosser and more solid body, e.g. 2 Cor. iii. 6.

**Acts of Carpus** (Gebhardt, p. 13). The true worshippers, according to the Lord's divine reminder, who worship God in spirit and truth, are made like to the glory of God and are immortal with Him, partaking of eternal life through the Word.

**Clement**, Frag. 39. What is God? God is, as the Lord says, spirit. But a spirit is properly a substance (essence <sup>1</sup>) incorporeal and uncircumscribed.

**Tertullian**, Praxeas, 7. Who will deny God to be a body, though God is spirit? For a spirit is obviously of its own kind (*sui generis*) in its own likeness. <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> οὐσία.

<sup>2</sup> Effigie.

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer, 2. The Lord had previously foretold that the hour was coming when true worshippers should worship the Father in spirit and truth; He has fulfilled what He previously promised, that we who have derived spirit and truth from His sanctification may also from His bestowal<sup>1</sup> worship truly and spiritually. For what can be a more spiritual prayer than what has been given us by Christ, by whom also the Holy Spirit has been sent to us? what can be a true petition before the Father rather than that set forth from His own mouth by the Son who is the Truth?

**Novatian**, Trinity, 6. God is not at all confined within the limits of a Temple. Thus God is not limited,<sup>2</sup> but the mind of the people is limited; nor is God straitened, but the understanding of the people is straitened. Finally in the Gospel the Lord said, John iv. 21, giving its causes in v. 24.

7. But the Lord's saying that God is (a) spirit was, I think, so spoken of the Father as to imply something beyond. . . . As when God is said to be light or love, His substance is not hereby expressed; so rightly when He is called spirit, He is not called all that He is; but that when the human mind advances by understanding even to spirit itself, being itself now turned into spirit, it may be able to conceive through the spirit God to be something more. . . . If you have taken the substance of God to be spirit, you will have made God a creature; for every spirit is a creature. . . . In the New Testament God is set forth as spirit that He may be proved to be the Restorer<sup>3</sup> of men dead in their sins, through the goodness of pardon bestowed on believers.

**Methodius**, Meats, xi. 2-3, Bonwetsch, p. 302. Our

<sup>1</sup> Traditione.

<sup>2</sup> 'Mediocris.'

<sup>3</sup> Refector.

Lord Jesus Christ taught that God was to be worshipped neither in Jerusalem nor on Mount Gerizim by those who have tasted the truth, but that they should lift up pure hands to Him in spirit and in truth. For what is holy is not confined to places or space.

**Eusebius**, Gospel Demonstration, i. 6, p. 18. Our Saviour says this (*vv.* 23–24) to those who thought that in Jerusalem alone or on some mountains or separate places God ought to be worshipped. ‘The hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem’ . . . Straightway and no long time after He said this, the sanctuary and altar at Jerusalem were destroyed in the siege, while the original worship of men dear to God before Moses shone forth to all men.

7, p. 27. (Christ fulfilled Law and Prophets, legislating for all nations and going beyond the Law), e.g. He teaches no longer to worship at Jerusalem, but in every place ; and not with incense and sacrifices, but in spirit and truth. These are words of a fully wise and most perfect Lawgiver.

*v.* 25. **Origen**, John, Tome xiii. 26, p. 236. It is worth seeing how the Samaritan woman, accepting nothing beyond the Pentateuch of Moses, looks for the coming of Christ as proclaimed from the Law alone. It is probable that they hoped for His advent from the Blessing of Jacob on Judah, Gen. xlix. 8–10; and from the prophecies of Balaam, Numb. xxiv. 7f, 17f. Perhaps also the Blessing of Moses on Judah would be agreed also by the Samaritans to refer to Christ, Deut. xxxiii. 7. But since the Samaritans boast of Joseph as their ancestor<sup>1</sup> perhaps some of them will take the Blessing

<sup>1</sup> πατριάρχην.



of Jacob on Joseph, and that of Moses, to be spoken of Christ's coming. . . . And the Saviour Himself, knowing that Moses has written many things of prophecy of Christ, says to the Jews, John v. 46. 'There are very many things to be found out of those written in the Law, which refer to Christ figuratively and obscurely ; <sup>1</sup> but I do not at present see any others more open and clear besides there. 'Messias' is the Hebrew word interpreted by the LXX 'Christ,' but by Aquila 'Anointed.' <sup>2</sup>

We must consider also 'when He is come, He will tell us all things ;' whether this was said by the Samaritan woman from tradition or from the Law. But we must not be ignorant that as Jesus arose from the Jews, not only saying but also proving that He was the Christ, so from the Samaritans a certain Dositheus arising said that he was the Christ of prophecy. From him to this very day are the Dositheans, carrying also books of Dositheus and relating certain stories about him, as not having tasted death but still existing somewhere in life. So much on the letter ; but also the heterodox mind beside Jacob's spring, which is thought by it to be a well, says of what it supposes to be a more perfect Word, naming this 'Christ,' 'When He is come, He will tell us all things' ; but He who is expected and hoped for, coming to it, says 'I who speak to thee am he'. . . Heracleon says that the Church was expecting the Christ, and had been persuaded that He alone knows all things.

We must search out whether Christ ever announced <sup>3</sup> Himself, and must compare these things with one another, e.g. John v. 46 ; viii. 18. As far as the letter goes let us learn from Him, and from hence, that He is

<sup>1</sup> αἰνιγματώδως.

<sup>2</sup> Ἑλιμμένος.

<sup>3</sup> εὐηγγελίσατο.

meek and lowly in heart, not too proud to speak of such great things to a woman water-bearer, who because of great poverty used to go out of the city and toil at drawing water. And the disciples on their coming are surprised, having previously observed the greatness of the Godhead in Him; they wonder in what way He who is so great was talking with a woman. But we, led by boastfulness and pride, disregard the meaner sort, forgetting that Gen. i. 26 applies to every man; so Ps. xxxiii. 15. . . . We do not know that He is God of the lowly and Helper of inferiors and Supporter of the weak,<sup>1</sup> Defence of the despairing, Saviour of the desperate. But He uses this woman as an apostle (envoy) to the people in the city, having kindled her so greatly through His words, vv. 28-30. Not failing such a woman, the Word manifests Himself most clearly, so that the disciples on their coming marvel that she has been thought worthy, being a female easily deceived, to attain intercourse<sup>2</sup> of the Word with her. But being persuaded that all things are done well by the Word, the disciples are not astounded nor in difficulty about the discussion with the Samaritan woman and conversation<sup>3</sup> with her. But perhaps they were astonished at the great goodness of the Word condescending to a soul scorning Zion, and trusting in the mountain of Samaria; therefore it is written 'They marvelled that He was talking with a woman.'

**Heracleon** says on 'I that speak to thee am He,' that since the Samaritan woman had been convinced about the Christ, that He would come and tell her all things, He says 'Know that I who speak with thee am He whom

<sup>1</sup> ἀφελπισμένων σκεπαστής καὶ ἀπεγνωσμένων σωτήρ.

<sup>2</sup> ὁμιλία.

<sup>3</sup> κοινολογία.

thou expectest.' And when He acknowledged that He Himself, the expected, had come, then came His disciples to Him, on whose account He had come to Samaria. But how had he come to Samaria on the disciples' account, seeing they had been with Him before ?

v. 27. (Clement), Virgins, ii. 15. He set an example to all generations of abstaining from associating with women.

v. 28. Origen, John, Tome xiii. 27, p. 239. The evangelist has not written idly of her leaving her waterpot. In the letter, it shows the great eagerness of the woman, who abandoned her waterpot and did not think so much of the more external and lowly duty as of helping many ; for she was moved with most kindly feeling, wanting to announce the Christ to her townsmen. . . . She calls them to see a man with a word greater than man's ; for what of Him was visible to the eyes was human.<sup>1</sup> It is right therefore for us also, forgetting and leaving the more external (corporeal) things, to hasten to impart to others the benefit we have received ; for the evangelist challenges us to this, by recording the praise of the woman for those who know how to read. But as regards allegory, we must consider what is the waterpot which the Samaritan woman leaves, after receiving Jesus' words. Perhaps the receptacle of the water honoured for its depth, the teaching of her former views, she now counts cheap and lays aside, having received, in what is superior to the waterpot, of the water which has already become in her a source of water springing up to eternal life ; for how without having partaken of this water would she with kindly feeling have preached Christ to her townsmen,

<sup>1</sup> ἀνθρώπος.



marvelling at Him telling her all that she had done. . . . Contrast the case of Rebekah, Gen. xxiv. . . .

Here a woman preaches Christ to the Samaritans ; at the end of the Gospels the woman who had seen the Saviour before all tells His resurrection to the apostles. But neither is the one thanked by the Samaritans as having preached the perfection of faith, for they say *v.* 42 ; and the other woman is not entrusted with the first touch of Christ (John xx. 17), which was reserved for Thomas. . . . But most accurately in the sequel the Samaritans ask Jesus not to abide in the city, but with *them*, that is, in their mind ; <sup>1</sup> for perhaps it was not possible for Him to abide in their city, since they themselves did well in coming out from the city and coming to Him.

Such things are well adapted for allegory. . . . It is not written after this that He entered into the city, but 'He abode there two days' ; nor is it said in what follows 'After the two days He went forth from the city,' but 'went forth from thence' ; for in a spiritual sense all the dispensation of help to the Samaritans took place beside Jacob's spring.

But Heracleon supposes the waterpot to be the disposition and thought receptive of life and of the power coming from the Saviour ; she, leaving this with Him, i.e. having such a vessel, in which she had come to receive the living water, with the Saviour, returned to the world preaching the advent of Christ by her call (or 'to those called' <sup>2</sup>), for through the Spirit and by the Spirit the soul is led to the Saviour. Consider whether the absolute leaving of the waterpot can be praised . . . it is not added that she left it with the

<sup>1</sup> ἡγεμονικῶς.

<sup>2</sup> τῇ κλήσει.

**Saviour.** Is it not Heracleon's interpretation improbable? And how is she who is spiritual not clearly persuaded about the Christ after so many words, but says 'Can this be the Christ'?

He has interpreted 'They went out from the city' as meaning 'from their former mode of life,' which was worldly; they were coming through their faith to the Saviour. But we must ask him, How does He abide with them the two days? for he has not noticed what we have already remarked that He is not recorded to have abode the two days *in the city*. . . .

v. 31. The disciples having gone away into the city to buy food, now return, perhaps having found serviceable food among the heterodox, i.e. suitable words. They bid Him eat, supposing it to be a convenient time for Him to take food between the departure of the woman into the city and the coming of the Samaritans to Him; for in the presence of no stranger did they set food before Him; perhaps the Samaritan woman might have been injured if she saw the disciples wishing to set before their Teacher food either actually from her city or thought to be so. (Similarly not in the presence of the Samaritans). . . . It is worth while seeing why they *asked* Him, and did not *say* to Him; it would have been written more simply 'In the meanwhile His disciples *said* to Him, Rabbi, eat.' They ask and intreat. . . . The disciples ever wish to feed the Word with what they find, that being strengthened and invigorated He may the more abide with those who feed Him, feeding in His turn those who set food before Him. Cp. Apoc. iii. 20. *Heracleon* says they wanted to share with Him what they had bought and brought from the Samaritans. (He makes some use of the Parable of the Virgins. The text is very defective here.)

v. 32f. **Clement**, *Paed.* I. vi. 45, 4. Another food is allegorized like milk, the will of God. Food to Christ was the accomplishment of the Father's will. Christ Himself is food for us babes.

**Origen**, *John*, Tome xiii. 33, p. 243. That which has no lack does not need food; that which needs food is not without lack. And it is clear that he who eats does not eat without needing food, but needing and lacking it. Bodies, being by nature in a state of flux, are fed on food which supplies the place of what passes away; but things superior to a body feed on incorporeal thoughts and words and healthy actions. They would not be dissolved into nothing, if they were not fed; for even bodies when not fed are not dissolved into nothing; but they lose being such as they are, when not fed with such things. But as all bodies needing food are not fed by the same qualities, nor is the same quantity of food sufficient for all, so we must understand it to be in the case of what are superior to bodies. Nor is the same quality of words and thoughts . . . and suitable actions suitable for all souls. . . . There is milk, 1 Peter ii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 2, and herbs, Rom. xiv. 2; Prov. xv. 17 . . . and solid food, Heb. v. 14; also poisonous food, as 2 Kings iv. 40. There is some spiritual food of grass for more irrational souls, Ps. xxiii. 1-2; and hay or straw, Isa. xi. 7; Gen. xxiv. 32. But if any one be more rational and therefore a spiritual <sup>1</sup> man, he eats spiritual bread (Ps. civ. 14-15), and drinks spiritual wine.

The disciples at the time did not know Christ's food . . . for He truly says 'which ye know not.' For what Jesus was effecting in doing the will of Him who sent Him, and perfecting His work, this the disciples

<sup>1</sup> νοητός.



knew not. . . . And it is not a wild thing to say, that not only do men and angels need spiritual foods, but also the Christ of God; for He Himself is so to speak always being equipped by the Father, who alone lacks nothing and is self-sufficing. The bulk of those who become disciples receive their food from Jesus' disciples, who are bidden to set it before the multitudes; but Jesus' disciples receive it from Jesus Himself, except sometimes from the holy angels; but the Son of God receives His food from the Father alone, not through any one. And it is not a strange thing to say that also the Holy Spirit is fed; but we must look for a passage of Scripture suggesting this.

In so far as we make progress we shall eat what is superior and greater, till perhaps we come to eat the same food as the Son of God, which at present the disciples know not. Heracleon has nothing upon this verse.

v. 33. Though Heracleon supposes that the disciples said this in a material sense <sup>1</sup> with their thoughts still too mean, and following the Samaritan woman who said 'Thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep'; yet it is worth our consideration whether they had not some more divine view. Perhaps they supposed that some angelic power had brought Him something to eat. And probably they were on this account taught that the food He had to eat was a superior one; viz. to do the will of Him who sent Him and to perfect His work.

v. 34. It is a food befitting the Son of God, when He becomes a doer of His Father's will, making this willing to be in Himself which was also in the Father, so that the will of God is in the will of the Son, and the

<sup>1</sup> σαρκικῶς.

will of the Son comes to be without variation from the will of the Father, so that there are no longer two wills but one will; this one will was the cause of the Son's saying 'I and the Father are one,' and because of this will he who has seen Him has seen the Son and has seen also Him who sent Him. And it is more fitting for us so to understand the will of the Father to be done by the Son, from which will the things also external to Him who wills were well done, than not troubling about the will to suppose that doing the will of Him who sent Him consisted in doing various external things. For this, viz. what is done external to Him who wills, apart from the aforesaid will, is not the entire will of the Father; but the whole will of the Father is being done by the Son when God's willing, coming to be in the Son, does those things which God's will wants. But the Son alone will be capable of doing all the Father's will; therefore He is His Image. We must consider also about the Holy Spirit. But the remaining holy things will do nothing against the will of God, and all that they will do, they will do according to the will of God, yet are not adequate to be moulded according to the whole will of God. And one holy being will admit (contain) <sup>1</sup> of the Father's will something greater or fuller or more distinct, in comparison with another holy being, and again there will be another receiving in a superior way to this; but He who said 'My food is to do the will of God who sent Me' will do the whole and entire will of God. After this He says by way of thanksgiving about God, John v. 19f. And this will is the Son's own food, by which He is what He is. But that the will refers to the

<sup>1</sup> χωρήσει.

disposition is shown by the following clause, which mentions next after the doing of the will the perfecting of the work of God.

We must further consider the meaning of this last clause. One will say more simply that it is the work enjoined, which is His who enjoined it, as if, e.g. we said that builders or cultivators were perfecting the work of him who took them for the work, by doing what they were taken for. Another will say that, if the work of God is perfected by Christ, it is clear that before it was perfected it was imperfect; how was it imperfect, being God's work? and how is God's work perfected by Him who said 'The Father who sent Me is greater than I'? But the perfecting of the work was the perfecting of what is rational, for the Word who was made flesh came to make this, which was imperfect, perfect. Was then the work created imperfect, and is the Saviour sent to perfect what is imperfect? is it not unreasonable to declare the Father to have been the Maker of something imperfect, but the Saviour to have perfected what was imperfect, being so created? I think some deeper mystery is involved in the passage. For perhaps what is rational was not at all imperfect at the time of its being put into Paradise. . . . He who could dress (till <sup>1</sup>) the tree of life and all things which God planted and afterwards made to spring up, could not reasonably be called imperfect. Perhaps then, being perfect, he has become imperfect because of his disobedience, and needed one who would perfect him from his imperfection; therefore the Saviour was sent, first to do the will of Him that sent Him, having here also become

<sup>1</sup> ἐργάζεσθαι.



His workman ; but secondly to perfect the work of God, and that each having been perfected may be familiar with solid food and may associate with wisdom ; Heb. v. 14 ; 1 Cor. ii. 6. . . . And when each of us, a work of God, is perfected by Jesus ; he will say 2 Tim. iv. 7f. But not only did man fall away from perfection, to imperfection, but also the sons of God, Gen. vi. 2f ; Jude 6, where ἀρχήν (' first ' estate) means not what is associated with authority <sup>1</sup> but what is opposed to ' end ' and associated with ' first ' (i.e. not ' rule ' but ' origin ').

Yet Jesus perfecting God's work, I mean everything that is rational, not man alone, perfects it (not always) in the same way ; for the more blessed beings are persuaded by word alone, not needing labour ; but others, having disobeyed the word, need labours, that by the application of words after the labours they may at last be perfected. But both of these are Jesus' own one food, both the doing of the will of the Father who sent Him, and the perfecting of His work.

Heracleon says that by these words the Saviour told the disciples that this was the subject of His discussion with the woman ; saying that the will of the Father was His own food ; for this was His nourishment and refreshment <sup>2</sup> and power. But he said it was the Father's will that men should know the Father and be saved, which was the Saviour's work ; for this He had been sent to Samaria, i.e. into the world. He has thus interpreted as Jesus' food even the discussion with the Samaritan woman ; which I think appears clearly to every one to be a mean and forced interpretation. But he has not established clearly how the Father's will is the Saviour's nourishment. And how is the Father's

<sup>1</sup> ἐξουσία.

<sup>2</sup> ἀνάπαυσις.

will also refreshment (rest ?) for the Lord says elsewhere, as if not all the Father's will was refreshment to Him, ' Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me ; yet not what I will, but what Thou wilt.' And whence is it shown that God's will is the Saviour's power ?

Frag. 59. ' Hath any one brought Him aught to eat ' shows that He accepted the ministries of those who offered them, though He was able to feed and not be fed. His disciples, being learned in the Law and studious, considering that it was time for food, conjectured that food had been brought to Jesus as to Daniel in Babylon by Habakkuk at God's command, and as to Elijah on his journey by an angel and by ravens. Yet though the disciples thought of material food, He Himself makes clear about what kind of food He had told them. (We gather that it was a time for food from it being the sixth hour of the day when Jesus sat at the spring and talked with the Samaritan women ; at the return of the disciples it was probably evening). . . .

Numbers Hom. xvii. 6, p. 339. His will was that the nations should turn to believe (*ad fidem*).

Cyprian, Testimonies iii. 60. ' That too great desire for food is not to be encouraged. '

v. 35. Origen, Prayer, 13, 5, p. 219. To every holy man, a genuine disciple of Jesus, is said by the Lord vv. 35-36.

Romans, Book iii. 7, p. 512 (also p. 581). (See on John iv. 7f for reference.) Here ' harvest ' refers first to the material harvest, in the second case to the spiritual.

John, Tome xiii. 39, p. 279. The following objections must be raised against those who take 35a too literally, in order that they may be persuaded that the Saviour often said spiritual things clear of sensible and corporeal

ones. If the time when Jesus said this was four months before the harvest, it is clear that it was winter. Harvest in Judæa begins about the month called Nisan, when the Passover is held, so that they sometimes make the unleavened bread of new corn. But suppose the harvest not to be in that month, but in the following one, called Iyar ; even so the time four months before that month is the depth of winter. When therefore we shall have shown that when He said these things it was the time for the harvest to be either in full course<sup>1</sup> or nearly over, our undertaking will have been proved.

We must observe that after the miracle at Cana the Lord is said to have gone down to Capernaum, where He remained not many days ; and the Passover was near, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. . . . After cleansing the Temple and talking with Nicodemus He and His disciples came into the land of Judæa, and there He was tarrying with them and baptizing. How long shall we assume this stay to have been ? it is not clearly stated. It appears that He left Judæa because the Pharisees knew that He was making and baptizing more disciples than John. . . . But if any one supposes that after the Passover Jesus spent a number of months in Judæa baptizing, with His disciples, so that the period of four months before the harvest was now come, we must lay before him that after a stay of two days among the Samaritans He went forth into Galilee, and it is recorded as if the Passover and what He had done in Jerusalem were but lately past, that the Galileans received Him, having seen all that He did in Jerusalem at the Feast. But probably it will be said in answer to this that there is no trouble in His having spent

<sup>1</sup> ἀκμάζοντα.



a long time in Judæa, and coming into Galilee four months before harvest; and there is nothing strange in the Galileans having welcomed Him because of what He had done at Jerusalem eight months before. To this it must be replied that on His coming to Galilee He came to Cana, when He healed the courtier's son; 'after this was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem'—(*v.* 1). But if this feast was that of the Passover, its name is not given; and the course of the history is cramped for room, specially as it is added a little later, 'the Jews' Feast of Tabernacles was near'.

Who would not confess the words 'Lift up your eyes,' etc., to be spiritual, and spiritual without anything literal? It would follow that the disciples also were saying that after four months would be the harvest which is comparable, as far as their idea went, with that designated by Jesus. . . . The majority of the disciples of the Word, supposing truth to be with difficulty attained by human nature, when they have understood about another life than the present life, rejecting at the present time the attainment of the things sought, suppose that after their kinship with the things belonging to the four elements they will pass above these and apprehend the truth. The disciples therefore say, according to the Lord's utterance about the harvest, which is the consummation of the gathered works of truth, that it comes after the present tetrad. The name 'months' is taken as suitable to the material language about the harvest; it would not have been right to speak in this connection about 'four days' or 'four years'; especially since the Word wants to escape the notice of the majority who are too material, concealing what is mystical but displaying what is simpler, in order that

the words uttered by the Saviour may be thought to be clear. Or perhaps the disciples' meaning is of this kind. There are four spheres of the four elements, lying below the ethereal nature; in the centre, the lowest, is that of the earth; around it is that of water, thirdly that of air, and fourthly that of fire; after which comes that of the moon, and so on. Perhaps the disciples suppose that on coming to the purer substance those prepared from hence will apprehend the truth. . . . But the Word-become-flesh, rebuking this supposition as unsound, says to those who hold it, *v.* 35. For indeed it seems to us incomprehensible not to understand Him to be speaking throughout of one harvest; since according to those who take it more simply He will be rebuking the disciples for saying what is true, supposing that the harvest will be after four months. This we have shown above could not be; especially as He says as though correcting the idea of the disciples, 'Say ye not this? But *I* say this'. Further, is it not strange to take 'Lift up your eyes,' etc., as allegorical throughout, while not to allegorize the previous sentence?

Yet **Heracleon**, like most people, has stopped at the letter, not thinking of allegory. He says that He is speaking of the harvest of the crops,<sup>1</sup> that this is still four months off; while the harvest of which He was speaking is already present. He has somehow taken the harvest to refer to the soul of the believers, saying that they are already ripe and ready for harvest, and fit to be gathered into the garner, that is, through faith into rest; at least, as many souls as are ready, for all are not so; for some were now ready, others were about

<sup>1</sup> τῶν γενημάτων.

to be so, others are going to be, others are still being sown. . . . But I do not know if he can show how the disciples lifting up their eyes can see the souls already fit to be gathered into the garner. Further, how are the next verses (*vv.* 37-38) true of souls? We then take the harvest of fruit gathered unto eternal life according to the perfecting of the Word (reason) which is laid as a seed in our minds, and has been perfected by further cultivation. . . .

'Lift up your eyes' occurs in many places of Scripture; the divine Word urges us to raise and lift up our thoughts and our power of vision, which lies below and cannot altogether lift up itself. Cp. Isa. xl. 26; Luke vi. 20; xiii. 11. . . . And no one, living in passions or engrossed in the flesh or entangled in material things has kept the commandment which says 'Lift up your eyes'; therefore such a man will also not behold the fields even though they are white to harvest already. Moreover no one working the works of the flesh has lifted up his eyes. The fields are already white unto harvest when the Word of God is present explaining and enlightening all the fields of the Scripture, which is fulfilled in His coming. And perhaps also all things of sense up to the heaven itself and the things in it are the white fields, ready to harvest to those who lift up their eyes; the principle (or 'account') of each being clearly presented to those who have received, by being transformed in the same image from glory to glory, the likeness of eyes that have seen how each of the things made was good; for 'God saw that it was good,' which is said in the case of every one of the creatures, means that God looked at the principles<sup>1</sup> of each and saw

<sup>1</sup> λόγους.



how, according to what principle each had been made, it was good. . . . (Otherwise how would wild beasts and creeping things be good?). . . . The Word present with the disciples urges His hearers to lift up their eyes upon the fields of Scriptures and upon the fields of the principle in every existing thing, that one may behold the whiteness and brightness of the light of truth which is everywhere. Cp. Prov. viii. 9.

*v.* 36. 43, p. 253. I think it necessary to bring forward all the various ways in which 'harvest' is spoken of in Scripture, and in how many connexions, in order that we may as far as possible be able to see to which of the many uses this passage belongs. We have the interpretation of the Parable of the Tares, Matt. xiii. 39, 'the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are angels.' In another passage it is used of the number of believers who feel their lack of such teaching as makes clear to them the objects of their belief, Matt. ix. 37. Further, the Apostle gives the name of 'sowing' to men's well-doing or sin in this life, and 'harvest' to what is laid up for each according to his deserts, Gal. vi. 7-8. Similarly Ps. cxxvi. 5f. And the name is often used of the ordinary harvest, as in Ruth i. 22. Thus there are five significations. In this passage it cannot have the usual meaning, as *v.* 36 will not hold good; nor the reference to the end of the world, as it is not reasonable to understand the exhortation to reap in this passage of the angel reapers. Nor is Gal. vi. 8, a parallel; for according to the words of the Apostle the sower and the reaper are the same; here they are distinct. . . . Likewise in the passage from the Psalms the same man sows and reaps. . . .

Heracleon, and perhaps also some churchman agreeing with him in this interpretation, will say that those things

are said similarly to 'the harvest is great, but the labourers few,' by men being ready for harvest and fit to be now gathered into the garner by faith unto rest, and fit for salvation and reception of the Word; according to Heracleon because of their constitution and nature, but according to the churchman because of some preparation of the mind which is ready for perfection, that it may be reaped. We must ask those who take it thus whether they are willing to accept that there had never been before our Saviour's coming a harvest like what would be hoped for from the times of the Gospel message. For if, by the harvest being great, many have believed, although the labourers—the Apostles—are few considering the number of those who have received the word, then either the words here involve that no one had believed before our Saviour's bodily advent, nor indeed has there been any labourer among believers; whereas it is most strange to say that Abraham and Moses and the prophets have not had the place of labourers nor that of those reaped. Or else if there have also previously been reapers and a harvest, the Saviour will seem to be promising nothing wonderful to those who lift up their eyes. . . . From these things it may be clear that none of the above conceptions is to be thought of in the mention of *harvest* here; nor that of the Apostle, 2 Cor. ix. 6. We are then looking for a seventh meaning. The harvest has been said by us to be the clear principle of the explanation of the Scriptures, or the principle which explains how all the things which God made were very good. He who reaps this harvest has two fruits of his reaping; one, that he receives wages; another, that he gathers fruit unto life eternal. And I think that because of the promises hereafter which will come to pass according to

what is written 'Behold the Lord, and his wages in his hand, to render to each according to his work', it is said 'He receiveth wages'; but because of the benefit from the contemplation itself, which accrues naturally to the mind and reason, being itself excellent even apart from other promises, it is written, 'He gathereth fruit unto life eternal'. . . .

But **Heracleon** considers that 'He that reapeth receiveth wages' is said because the Saviour calls Himself a reaper; and he understands our Lord's wages to be the salvation and restoration of those who are reaped, by His resting upon them. But he says that 'Gathereth fruit unto life eternal' is said either because what is gathered is fruit of eternal life, or because it is itself eternal life. But I think his interpretation to be obviously forced, when he says that the Saviour receives wages, and fuses the wages and the gathering of the fruit into one, whereas the Scripture distinctly states *two* things.

If then our interpretation of the lifting up of the Apostles' eyes and the sight of the fields is a successful one, we must now in accordance with these things examine the meaning of the words, 'That the sower and the reaper may rejoice together.' I think that in every art and science dependent on many observations he who finds out the beginnings sows, while others taking these over and working them out and delivering their discoveries to others, become by their discoveries causes to their successors, who are unable both to find out the beginnings and to connect what follows and to add the end of the arts and sciences, of receiving full fruit of them as in harvest. But if this is true of arts and some sciences, how much more of the art of arts and science of sciences? For the discoveries of the former thinkers



have been worked out by their successors, who have handed down to those, who next examine the things discovered, means for the whole body of the truth to be gathered together in wisdom. But when the whole work of the art of arts is completed, the sower and the reaper rejoice together, God the Rewarder gathering them all unto one end. But see whether the sowers are Moses and the prophets, who wrote the things 'for our admonition, to whom the ends of the world are come,' and who proclaimed the coming of Christ; the reapers, the Apostles who received Christ and beheld His glory, which agrees with the rational seeds of prophecy concerning Him, which were reaped according to the working out and consideration of the mystery (once hidden, but now revealed; Eph. iii. 5-9; Rom. xvi. 25f . . .) when the true Light has made the fields, by shining upon them, white unto harvest already.

According to this argument the fields, in which the seeds had been cast, are the Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets. Therefore let us as genuine disciples of Jesus, lift up our eyes and behold the fields sown by Moses and the Prophets, that we may know their whiteness and in what manner it is now possible to reap them and to gather fruit unto life eternal, while at the same time hoping to receive wages from the Lord of the fields <sup>1</sup> who supplies the seeds. That the sower and the reaper rejoice together, when pain and sorrow and groaning have fled, in the age to come, will be acknowledged by every one who has read Matt. viii. 11. But if any one is doubtful about accepting that even now every sower rejoices with every reaper, let him understand that in a sense a harvest was the Transfiguration

<sup>1</sup> χωρῶν.

of Jesus appearing in glory not only to the reapers, Peter and James and John, who went up with Him, but also to the sowers, Moses and Elijah; for they rejoice along with them, seeing the glory of the Son of God, which, so greatly enlightened by the Father and enlightening those who see it, Moses and Elijah had not previously seen, as they now behold it along with the holy apostles. But we take *v.* 36 as possibly general, because in what follows the reapers are spoken of as many <sup>1</sup> and so also those who have laboured, clearly in sowing (*v.* 38). So *v.* 36 may be general 'Every one that reapeth . . . that every one that soweth and every one that reapeth may rejoice together' . . .

(See on Matt. xiii. 17, § 49.)

. . . Perhaps the sower, as sharing in the wages of the reaper and the gathering of the fruit gathered unto life eternal, will rejoice along with the reaper.

*vv.* 37-38. Irenæus, IV. xxxvii. 1, H.; IV. xxiii. 1, p. 259, M. Who then are those who have laboured, who have served God's plans? Clearly, patriarchs and prophets, who both foreshadowed our faith and spread in the world what and of what nature the coming of the Son of God would be; that those men who were to come after them, having fear of God, might easily receive the coming of Christ, instructed by the prophets.

IV. xxxix. H.; IV. xxv. 3, p. 261, M. Abraham, in himself prefigured the two testaments, in which some sowed while others reaped; 'for herein is the saying true, that there is one people that sows, another that reaps,' but one God furnished both with what are suitable, seed to the sower, bread for food to the reaper. . . . The Patriarchs and prophets sowed abroad the word

<sup>1</sup> πλείονας.

about Christ ; but the Church has reaped, i.e. derived the fruit. Therefore they also themselves pray to have a dwelling in it . . . that the sower and the reaper may both rejoice together in the kingdom of Christ. . . .

**Origen**, John, Tome xiii. 49 (47), p. 260. If we explain the passage according to the example taken from arts and sciences, it is clear how the saying is true that the sower is one and the reaper another ; or if we take it that Moses and the Prophets have sown, but that those have beheld who have lifted up their eyes according to the counsels of our Saviour Jesus on the fields having become white . . . even so it is clear how the sower is one and the reaper another. But consider whether the distinction between one and another can be understood to depend upon some being justified by such a conduct of life, but the others by a different one from this—so as to say that the man of the Law is one, the man of the Gospel another. Yet they rejoice together, one end being laid up for both from one God through one Christ in one Holy Spirit.

**Heracleon** interpreted ' The sower rejoices because he sows, and because now some of his seeds are gathered in, and he has the same hope for the rest also ; the reaper in like manner rejoices because he reaps ; but the first began sowing, the second reaping ; for both could not have begun with the same thing, for sowing must be done first, then reaping afterwards. Yet when the sower has ceased to sow, the reaper will still be reaping ; yet at present both working their own work rejoice together, counting the perfecting of the seeds a common joy. ' On *v.* 37 he says, ' For the Son of Man who is above the place <sup>1</sup> (?) sows, but the Saviour,

<sup>1</sup> ὑπὲρ τὸν τόπον.



being Himself Son of man, reaps and sends as reapers the angels understood by the disciples, each to his own soul.' But he has not at all clearly explained who the two Sons of Man are, one of whom sows and one reaps.

v. 38. 50, p. 261. It is not hard from the foregoing to observe how Jesus sent the disciples to reap that on which they had not laboured, but those before them; for Moses and the prophets having laboured that they might be able to receive the understanding of the mysteries of which they have left us the traces in their own writings, the Apostles have entered into the labour of Moses and the prophets, under the guidance of Jesus, reaping the thought in them and gathering it into the garners of their own soul.

And the Word is ever making the labours of their predecessors clearer to those who genuinely become disciples, without labour like that of the sowers. (Origen now discusses whether angels sow souls in bodies or whether this is the work of God Himself.)

**Heracleon** says that 'these seeds were not sown through them or by them,' viz. the apostles; 'those who have laboured are the angels of the dispensation, through the mediation of whom they were sown and reared.' His exposition of 'Ye are entered into their labours' is, 'Sowers and reapers have not the same labour; the former sow, breaking the earth in cold and wet and toil, and tend the crop through the whole winter, hoeing and plucking out weeds; but those who have entered upon fruit now ready in summer reap in joy.' Any one may compare our interpretation with Heracleon's, and judge which is the most successful.

v. 39. 51, p. 263. Scripture takes up again the mention of the Samaritans who had come from the city

to Him (*vv.* 28–30). If we hold fast what has been said above, about Samaria and the Samaritan woman and Jacob's spring, it is not hard to see how those who had previously been entangled in heresies, on meeting with sound teaching, forsake the city, so to speak, of their doctrines, and coming forth from it believe soundly. . . .

**Heracleon** interprets 'From the city' as meaning 'From the world.' 'Because of the word of the woman' means 'through the spiritual Church'; 'many' are mentioned because the psychic are many; the one is the incorruptible nature of the election, which is unique and one.

*v.* 40f. With some plausibility Matt. x. 5 will be brought against this passage. The Saviour who said 'Into a city of Samaritans enter ye not' was asked to abide with the Samaritans, and abode there two days; it is clear therefore that His disciples also went in with Him. To this it must be replied that to enter into a city of Samaritans is to come to be in any falsely named knowledge of those who profess to attend to words of Law or Prophets or Gospel or Apostle. But it is possible on the Samaritans leaving their own city and coming to Jesus beside Jacob's spring, for Jesus accepting the choice of those who have believed, to abide with those who have asked Him. I think that John has deliberately not said that the Samaritans asked Him to enter into Samaria, or into the city, but to abide with them; for to abide with the believer is not the same as to enter into his city. So he does not say 'He abode in that city two days' or 'He abode in Samaria,' but 'abode there', i.e. with those who had asked Him. For Jesus abides with those who have asked Him, especially when those who ask Him are come out from

their city and are coming to Jesus, following the example of Abraham, Gen. xii. 1.

He abides two days ; for they could not yet admit<sup>1</sup> also His third day, since they were not able to admit any wonder, such as those did who at Cana on the third day supped with Jesus at the marriage.

The starting point of the many from Samaria who believed was the word of the woman . . . but the increase and multiplication of the many more believers was no longer because of the woman's word but because of His own word. For not in like manner as when witness is borne to Him through another is the Word beheld of Himself, enlightening him who receives Him.

Heracleon says ' He abode with them, not in (among) them. Two days, either the present age, and the age to come, at the marriage ; or the time before His Passion and the time after it ; having spent this with them, and turned many more to faith through His own word, He parted from them.' To his observation that ' with them ' is written, not ' in them,' we must say that ' Lo I am *with* you,<sup>2</sup> not ' *in* you', ' all the days ', is similar to ' with them '.<sup>3</sup> In his interpretation of the two days he has not considered the ages coming on after the age to come, Eph. ii. 7, nor does he see that not only before the Passion and after the Passion is Jesus with those who come to Him, afterwards parting from them, for He is always with the disciples, never leaving them ; so that they say ' No longer do I live, but Christ liveth in me '.

v. 42. 53 (52), p. 265. They deny the faith that is because of the woman's speech, finding to have heard the Saviour Himself to be something better than it, so as to know that He is truly the Saviour of the world.

<sup>1</sup> ἐχώρουν.

<sup>2</sup> μεθ' ὑμῶν.

<sup>3</sup> παρ' αὐτοῖς.



And is it better to become an eyewitness of the Word, and to hear Him teaching without intermediate instruments and impressing without teachers the mind which finds clearness in the figures of the truth, than, not seeing Him nor being enlightened by His power, to hear the account of Him through ministers who have seen Him. For it is impossible for him who is taught by one who has seen and tells of Him to have the same experience in his mind as he who has seen Him ; and it is better to walk through sight than through faith. . . .

**Heracleon** takes the passage more simply, saying that 'alone' is omitted ('no longer because of thy saying alone'). On the next sentence he says 'The men at first under the guidance of men believe the Saviour, but when they have met with His words, they believe no longer because of human testimony alone, but because of the truth itself.'

## XXVII

## JOHN iv. 43-54

*vv.* 43-44. **Origen**, John, Tome xiii. 54 (53), p. 267. The language seems altogether disconnected ; what has *v.* 43 in common with *v.* 44 ? For if Samaria had been His own country, and He had been dishonoured there, so that on this account He went forth not having stayed there more than two days, *v.* 44 would be a natural sequel. But also if it had been written 'After the three days He went forth into Galilee, but did not come into His own country,' *v.* 44 would be in place. And perhaps this is the meaning of the passage, but John being untrained in language has expressed his meaning awkwardly. For it is not said into what place of Galilee they received Him ; but it is afterwards written that He

came unto Cana of Galilee. But the evangelist understands <sup>1</sup> himself and does not miss his object. Having first said how the Lord left Judæa and went into Galilee, having related His going through Samaria, what was said beside Jacob's spring, and how He abode two days with the Samaritans, he duly gives His arrival in Galilee, although not a few things have been said in between. But since above we have said that Judæa is the symbol of some better thing, lying as it does above, but Galilee of something inferior, accordingly God who loves men does not overlook even the inferiors who need His visitation; therefore He leaves the Samaritans quickly, in order to come to the Galileans who received Him gladly and to heal the courtier's son. Having done these things in Galilee on the coming of the feast of the Jews He goes up to Jerusalem, making the feast better and more joyful by His own presence.

A meaning of *v.* 44 must be sought worthy of the testimony of Jesus. The 'own country' of the prophets was in Judæa; and it is clear that they had had no honour among the Jews, being stoned, sawn asunder. . . (Heb. xi. 37). And the Jews are reproached by him who said to them Acts vii. 52. They finally, dishonouring the supreme Prophet, through whom the prophets have become prophets, said 'Away with Him, away with Him, crucify Him.' But in my country all the prophets have been honoured, including Him who arose from God according to what was said by Moses, Deut. xviii, 15. For His own country was not among the Gentiles, who have received their salvation by Israel's fall. Elsewhere it is written 'No prophet is acceptable in his own country and in his own house.' But we may admire the truth of

<sup>1</sup> κατακούει.

the Saviour's declaration, which has extended not only to the holy prophets, dishonoured among their own people <sup>1</sup> and to our Lord Himself, but also to those who have passed their time in any form of wisdom and been despised by their fellow-citizens, so that some of them were even put to death. These things may be gathered from Greek history about the philosophers or astronomers or those distinguished in any forms of learning. And the words of Matt. xiii. 55f are of those of men dishonouring Him. And this most wonderful thing has come about in the case of the prophets, that their citizens have not honoured them in their life, but deck their corpse, building and garnishing their tombs. . . .

Frag. 60. He calls Judæa 'his own country,' which He has left on this account. For the evangelist giving the reason for His coming into Galilee, writes 'A prophet hath no honour in his own country.' This testimony is given in the former Gospels, Mark vi. 4. For certainly all those before His coming were dishonoured in Jerusalem and Judæa ; for this is their land and country ; so that the Saviour says generally, <sup>2</sup> 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent to her.'

v. 45. Origen, John, Tome xiii. 56 (55), p. 269. It is worth while to see whether the cause of the reception of the Saviour by the Galileans was so great as to produce in them astonishment and admiration for the Saviour, so that they received Him ; and, further, to what it is referred, viz. to the many things Jesus did at Jerusalem. But we have found nothing previously mentioned except the Cleansing of the Temple—ii. 14f. What then was there in this of such magnitude that the Galileans were

<sup>1</sup> *παρὰ τοῖς οἰκείοις.*

<sup>2</sup> *καθόλου.*



moved thereby to receive the Lord? . . . If we remember what was said on that passage, pointing out that in those things no less power of the Saviour is displayed than that which operated in the blind receiving sight and the deaf hearing and the lame walking, it must be said that perhaps the Galileans having considered this, and astonished at the divinity of Jesus, received Him when He came into Galilee, having seen all things that He did at Jerusalem, all those things being the Cleansing of the Temple. . . . But I think that He had then done not only these but also other signs, for it is added (ii. 23) that many believed in His Name, beholding His signs which He did; of which Nicodemus also says (iii. 2). . . . 'No one can do these signs which Thou doest except God be with Him.' For the feast at Jerusalem is the starting point for the Galileans to receive also the Son of God coming to them; for had they not seen the things at the feast they would not have received Him; nor would He Himself have so readily visited men not prepared to receive Him, leaving those who asked Him to abide with them. But those who received Jesus received also Him who sent Him, Luke ix. 48.

*vv. 46-53. Irenæus*, II. xxxiii. 1, H.; II. xxii. 3, p. 147, M. (This miracle identified with that of Matt. viii. 5f.) After the healing of the Centurion's son with a word, saying 'Go thy way, thy son liveth', He a second time went up to Jerusalem. . . .

*Origen*, John, Tome xiii. 58 (57), p. 271. We have by no means found the name of king's officer <sup>1</sup> current among the Jews; hence neither do we settle <sup>2</sup> in our mind, as far as the history goes, who was this king's

<sup>1</sup> βασιλικός.

<sup>2</sup> ἐπιβάλλομεν.

officer and from what king he took his title. The plainer reader will think this king's officer to be some man of King Herod; but another like him will say that this king's officer belonged to Cæsar's household, doing some business about Judæa at the time; for he is not clearly found to be a Jew, since it does not follow from his son having been sick at Capernaum that he belonged to the people in those parts. But his rank appears also from the fact that when he was now going down his servants (plural) met him, saying that his son lived. . . . Granting the literal meaning, let us examine what he and his son may symbolize. We know no other great King, whose city is the true Jerusalem, and King of Kings, who went to a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return, and who returned as King, than Him who said 'But I was appointed king by Him on Sion His holy mountain, declaring the Lord's decree' (Ps. ii. 6, LXX). Those who saw this day and rejoiced are all king's men, and those who believe in the Father through Him are named from His kingdom; one of those and his sick son and what follows form the subject of our enquiry. We said above that the whole people is a son of Abraham, as they themselves boast,—John viii. 33, 53; cp. Luke iii. 8; Matt. iii. 9; also Isa. li. 2. . . . It is clear that he first counts as the father of the people, wherefore also he is specially named 'Father'. We suppose therefore that the king's officer is Abraham, and that his son sick at Capernaum and about to die is the race of Israel, grown sick (weak) in their religion and the observance of the divine laws, come near to dying to God by having been inflamed by the fiery darts of the Enemy and therefore said to be in fever. But it is clear from what is said of Jeremiah in 2 Mac. xv. 14, that the saints who have gone forth from life are

concerned about the People. See then if it is possible for us to interpret that Abraham, being a King's officer, on his son having fallen sick and being about to die, requests that the sufferer may be helped by our Saviour; coming to Him and asking Him that He may come down and heal his son, for he was about to die.

v. 48 refers to the multitude of his sons, and perhaps also to himself. For as John expecting the coming of Christ was awaiting the sign given him, that by it he might know Him who was prophesied, John i. 33f, so also the saints who had previously fallen asleep, looking for the coming of the Christ in body, were distinguishing <sup>1</sup> Him by the signs and wonders, believing through them the object of their hope. But he beseeches the Lord more quickly to come down to his sick child, fearing lest death should first have seized upon the sufferer; and Christ drives away the fever by a word, making promise to the father of the life of the child in danger, by his word 'Go thy way, thy son liveth'. But this king's officer has not only a son, but also servants, signified by those born in Abraham's house, and bought with his money—some humbler and inferior class of believers. These, present with the sick child, behold his recovery (salvation) and meet the father bringing the good news of the life of him who was cured by the saying 'Thy son liveth'; rejoicing because they did not previously think that their master's son was living. Not without meaning does the fever leave him at the *seventh* hour, for the number was that of *rest*.

But he who was sick and was healed in the son at Capernaum, in the 'field of comfort'—a class of sick men who have not been altogether without fruits; and

<sup>1</sup> ἐχαρακτῆριζον.



the father's faith on learning the salvation of his son becomes most perfect ; he believes Christ, with his whole house. . . .

But it must be considered also whether the king's officer is the image of some power of the rulers of this age, and his son is that of the leading people under his authority—of his elect, so to speak—and his sickness is an evil disposition contrary to the mind of the ruler. For I think that even some of these rulers, astonished at His power and divinity, have had recourse to Him and entreated Him for those under their government ; for why while men receive repentance and turn from unbelief to faith shall we hesitate to say the like of the Powers ? . . . But I think that something took place in the case of the rulers also, who changed for the better at Christ's coming so that some whole cities or even nations have been brought into connection with Christ in a closer way than many. . . .

**Heracleon** appears to interpret the ' King's officer ' as the Demiurge (creator), since he also reigned over those under him ; but because his kingdom was brief and temporary, he was named ' king's officer ',<sup>1</sup> as if a petty king set over a petty kingdom by a universal king. He explains the son at Capernaum to mean him who is in the lower part of the intermediate region, that by the sea—i.e. that which is joined to matter ; and says that his own man being sick, i.e. not in his natural condition, was in ignorance and sins. He takes ' from Judæa into Galilee ' to mean ' from Judæa above '.

But somehow or other he is led when commenting on ' about to die ' to think that the views of those who suppose the soul to be immortal are overthrown ; supposing

<sup>1</sup> βασιλικός.

the destruction of soul and body in hell to contribute to the same result. Heracleon does not think the soul to be immortal, but to be suited for salvation, saying it is the corruptible which puts on incorruption and the mortal which puts on immortality, when its death is swallowed up in victory. Further he says that 'Except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe' is fitly said to such a character<sup>1</sup> having a nature to be persuaded through works and through sense—perception<sup>2</sup> and not to believe a word. He supposes 'Come down ere my child die' to have been said because death is the end of the Law, which destroys through sins; therefore before it has become completely dead in respect of sins, the father entreats the only Saviour to help his son, i.e. the nature of this kind. Further he has explained 'Thy son liveth' to have been said by the Saviour in humility,<sup>3</sup> since He did not say 'Let him live' nor declared that it was He who had furnished the life. And he also says that having come down to the sufferer and having healed him of his sickness, that is, of his sins, and having quickened him through forgiveness, He said 'Thy son liveth'. And he adds on 'the man believed' that even the Demiurge is ready to believe that the Saviour can heal even in His absence. He has taken the servants of the king's officer to be the angels of the Demiurge, who by saying 'Thy son liveth' tell him that he is in proper and fit condition, no longer doing what is unfitting. He thinks the servants tell the king's officer of the recovery of his son, because, as he thinks, the angels were the first to see the actions of the men in the world, if they conducted themselves healthily and sincerely from the time of the Saviour's coming.

<sup>1</sup> πρόσωπον.<sup>2</sup> αἰσθήσεως.<sup>3</sup> κατὰ ἀτυφίαν.

Further, on ' the seventh hour ' he says that through the hour is marked <sup>1</sup> the nature of what was healed. Finally he has explained ' and himself believed and his whole house ' of the order of angels, and of the men more akin to him. But he says it is a question whether some angels will be saved, viz. those who came down to the daughters of men. And he considers that the ruin of the men of the Demiurge is signified by Matt. viii. 12 ; Isa. i. 2, 4, etc.

Heracleon's words are too rash and impious ; if true, they would have called for full proof. But I do not know how it is that he disbelieves in the immortality of the soul, not understanding how many things are meant by the word ' Death '. He ought to have considered carefully and precisely whether it is mortal according to all these meanings. For if it is because it admits of sin, and ' the soul that sinneth it shall die ', we too will call it mortal ; but if he considers its death to be its entire dissolution and disappearance, we will not admit it, not being able even in thought to see a mortal substance turning into an immortal, and a corruptible nature to incorruption, for this is like saying anything changes from a body to something incorporeal, as if there was some common substratum of the nature of bodies and incorporeal things, which remains, as experts say what is material remains, while the qualities change to incorruption. But it is not the same thing for the corruptible nature to put on incorruption and for it to change into incorruption. Similarly mortal nature must not be said to change into immortality, but to put it on.

Again since Heracleon has thought the psychic nature to be persuaded through works and sense-perception,

<sup>1</sup> χαρακτηρίζεται.



not by words, let us ask him of what nature *Paul* was. If he was of spiritual nature, how did he come to believe through the miraculous appearance? But if he could not have believed otherwise, it follows on this view that he too was psychic. And is it not impious to say that the angels of the Demiurge behold, before he himself does, the recovery and sincerity of the conduct of those improved by the Saviour's power? this is contrary to the clear conception of the Demiurge, and also contrary to Scripture—Jer. xxiii. 24; Ps. vii. 10; xciv. 11. . . . And why is the nature of what is healed marked by the number of the hour, rather than the nature of the healing, which takes place at the number appropriate to *rest*? And that some of the psychic are destroyed, springs from the use of an ambiguity and introduces another fourth nature, which is not intended.

v. 54. 62 (60), p. 277. The phrase is ambiguous—it may mean.

1. Jesus on His visit from Judæa to Galilee did two signs, of which this is the second; or

2. Of two signs which Jesus did in Galilee, He did the second on coming from Judæa into Galilee.

This last is to be accepted as the true meaning; for He did not do the former sign (the change of water into wine) on coming from Judæa into Galilee, which He did on the morrow after Andrew abode with the Lord the tenth hour of the day (John i. 43). . . .

The spiritual lesson of the notice seems to be this—the two visits of our Saviour to Cana may be taken as symbols of His two visits to the earth, which, because it has become His possession, since He had received all authority as in heaven so on earth, was named *Cana*. So on the former visit after the Baptism He gladdens us

as we feast with Him, giving us to drink of the wine of His power, which was water when originally drawn, but became wine when Jesus changed it. For verily before Jesus came the Scripture was water, but at Jesus' hand has been made to us wine. But on His second visit He releases from fever according to the time of judgment wherewith God has entrusted Him to judge ; releasing from fever and completely curing the son of the king's man, whether Abraham or some ruler with the title. . . .

It may be said that this double visit may be understood to be to His whole possession. Consider whether according to this the first is primary, the second subsequent—the primary one gladdens those who receive Him, by the second those who previously would not drink His wine are freed from every disease and from the fiery darts of the enemy. The elements of the first mighty work are undivided, for at Cana were both He who makes the wine and those who drink it ; but those of the second have some division, for the sick son was not where Jesus was, for he was not at Cana but at Capernaum. And the word of power goes forth from Cana, for it is said at Cana ' Thy son liveth ' ; but the effect of the word comes to pass at Capernaum, for there the sick son was healed by Jesus' word. . . . (See also 57 (56), p. 271.)

We find him healed by a word by Jesus who was not thought to be present with him ; as also was the centurion's servant ; for the Lord does not come to the centurion's house.

(Thus Origen distinguishes these two miracles ; Irenæus, above, identifies them.)

We have noticed that both of them were sick at Capernaum ; so also Peter's wife's mother. These

were healed there by day—before evening—but when evening had come many were brought to Him. Matt. viii. 16 (q. v.). . . .

Wonders<sup>1</sup> are never mentioned apart from signs,<sup>2</sup> while 'signs' are often found apart from 'wonders'. . . . The difference is, I think, that these marvellous and portentous mighty works, in respect of their very marvellousness and their unwonted wondrous and super-human character, are named 'wonders'; wherefore also we find the name of 'signs' given to things which are not marvellous, e.g. the sign of circumcision. . . . But 'wonders' are never named alone, because no wonder has taken place in Scripture without being a sign and symbol of something beyond what is perceived by sense. If there had been any wonder done not symbolizing something else, it would have been written that Jesus—or e.g. Moses or some one of the saints—had done this wonder. When then we are taught from the Scriptures that we ought to seek the thing of which what has been done is a sign, it is said 'This second sign, again did Jesus'; but when the king's officer is reproached as not going to believe without the sight of marvels, it is no longer said 'Except ye see signs, ye will not believe'; for the signs when done do not challenge to believe, *qua* signs, if the sign be not also a wonder. But it is said 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe'—ye believe because of the marvellousness; we perform it in addition because of that of which it is a sign. Cp. Ps. lxxviii. 43, 'signs in Egypt, wonders in field of Tanis (Zoan)'. . . .

This is Jesus' seventh visit: (1) to Bethany (Bethara) to be baptized; (2) to Cana; (3) to Capernaum; (4) to

<sup>1</sup> τέρατα.

<sup>2</sup> σημεῖα.



Jerusalem ; (5) to the land of Judæa ; (6) to Samaria ; (7) to Cana a second time.

## XXVIII

## JOHN v. 1-47

v. 1f. Irenæus, II. xxxiii. 1, H.; II. xxii. 3, p. 147, M. After the healing of the *Centurion's* son with a word, saying ' Go thy way, thy son liveth,' He a second time went up to Jerusalem for the feast of the Passover, when He cured the paralytic, who was lying beside the pool thirty-eight years.

Tertullian, Baptism, 5. If it seems a novelty for an angel to interpose in waters, it was an example anticipating what was to come. An angel interposing moved the pool of Bethesda. Those complaining of every disease were waiting. For if any one had anticipated others in descending thither, he ceased to complain after washing. This figure of bodily healing proclaimed spiritual healing. . . . Those who used to free one man every year, now daily preserve peoples, death being abolished by washing away of sins.

Jews, 13. The pool of Bethesda for healing Israel of sickness up to Christ's coming ceased then from its benefits, when by the persistence of their madness the Lord's Name was blasphemed through them.

Origen, John, Tome xiii. 54 (53), p. 268. On the coming of the Feast of the Jews, He goes up to Jerusalem, making the Feast greater and more joyous by His own presence.

39, p. 250. If this Feast was that of the Passover, its name is not added, and there is hardly room for this.

Frag. 61. He did not judge it necessary to go about and heal the sick anywhere, so as not to incur the reputation of self-pleasing ; but by healing one He makes

Himself through him manifest to all. For this reason He goes to the Sheep Pool, with its five porches ; for it had one in the middle besides the four round about it. It was called the Sheep Pool from the sheep brought for the feasts being assembled there, and from the inwards of the sheep that were sacrificed being washed in that water. Hence also a great number of people possessed with various diseases were gathered together in the place in hope of healing, as though the water itself had power in which the inwards of the animals offered to God and sacrificed were put. And God co-operating with this idea of theirs at some uncertain times prepared a movement of the water ; believing this to be accomplished by some divine operation, they then went down and secured cure, though many were not cured at the same time ; only the first who went down enjoyed the benefit,<sup>1</sup> in order that the ease of the cure might not lessen the wonder ; but watching longer<sup>2</sup> and awaiting with much eagerness the movement of the water, they are hence taught to have fitting thoughts<sup>3</sup> even after their cure. Therefore, though there were many sick, He did not cure all, but displaying His own power He chose one who was specially held down by a more severe affliction, and, by length of time was despairing of recovery<sup>4</sup>. . . . Going to him He did not straightway say 'Take up thy bed and walk ;' but starts with some conversation (sequence of words) with him, as in the case of the woman of Samaria.

v. 8. Frag. 63 (on John ix. 6). He commanded the paralytic to take up his bed on a day when it was not lawful to do this, that so each one accusing Him of the

<sup>1</sup> χάρις.

<sup>3</sup> λογισμόν.

<sup>2</sup> μειζόνως.

<sup>4</sup> σωτηρία.

transgression might learn the truth of what had taken place.

v. 14. **Irenæus**, V. xv. 2, p. 311. All the others to whom sickness had befallen because of their transgression, He healed by word; to whom also He said 'Behold thou art made whole, sin no more lest something worse come to thee'—displaying that sicknesses have followed up men on account of the sin of disobedience.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies, iii. 27. Heading 'That one who is baptized may lose the grace he has gained, if he do not preserve innocence.'

Epistle xiii. 2. Not the attainment in itself<sup>1</sup> but the consummation preserves a man for God. The Lord Himself taught this, John v. 14. He may say this now to the confessor. Compare the fate of Solomon and Saul.

Demeanour of Virgins, 2. These are the words of the Lord who saves and teaches, who alike heals and warns. . . . He gives a manner of life (*morem vivendi*). He gives a law of innocence, after having bestowed healing.

**Eusebius**, Prophetic Selections, iv. 24. He exhorts by His teaching to go forth from the former bonds of sins, saying, 'Behold thou art made whole; sin no more.'

v. 17. **Clement**, Strom. I. i. 12, 3. The Saviour is ever saving and ever working as He sees the Father doing.

**Origen**, Numbers, Hom. xxiii. 4, p. 359. Showing that in no Sabbath of this age does God rest from the administration of the world and from providing for mankind. . . . Even up to the end of the world He does not cease from thus providing and administering.

<sup>1</sup> Statim.



**Tertullian**, Praxeas, 21. (Showing distinction between Father and Son.) 'The Father ; and I, the Son.'

**Methodius**, Symposium, ii. 1. The Creator is even now forming man. . . . He is still at work setting forth <sup>1</sup> the world, as also the Lord taught.

Resurrection, ii. 9. Bonwetsch, p. 211. All things are wrought by the Wisdom of God . . . whom the ancients called Nature and Providence.

**Epiphanius**, Haer. lxvi. 81, p. 701. Manes says this is opposed to the Law, which commanded to keep Sabbath.

**Hegemonius**, 35 (31). He worked in making heaven or sun or moon or animals or plants or such like. But on the completion of these visible things He rested from such work ; but He preserves (salvat) until now, by working invisible things, and from within.

**Eusebius**, Psalm xci (xcii). God is said to work when He is considering things of sense and is engaged in the works of providing for the world.

v. 19. **Tertullian**, Praxeas, 15. The Son has ever been working, by the authority and will of the Father, because (v. 19) . . . 'the Father doing,' i.e. in thought.<sup>2</sup> For the Father acts in thought and the Son who is in the Father's thought sees and accomplishes. So all things are made through the Son and without Him is nothing made.

v. 21. (This passage shows distinctness of Father and Son.)

**Novatian**, Trinity, 14. If Christ is only a man, how does the Son do in like manner what the Father does, whereas a man cannot do works like the heavenly works of God ?

**Origen**, First Principles, I. ii. 6, p. 55. For if all

<sup>1</sup> ζωγραφεῖν.

<sup>2</sup> 'Sensu.'

things that the Father does, these also the Son does in like manner ; in that the Son does all things just as the Father the image of the Father is expressed <sup>1</sup> in the Son, who is born from Him as some will proceeding from His mind.

12, p. 59. ' Wisdom ' is termed ' the unspotted image of God's working ' <sup>2</sup> . . . So Jesus Christ, who is the Wisdom of God, declares of Himself John v. 19. Since then in no work at all does the Son differ and vary from the Father in power, nor is there any other work of the Son than of the Father, but one and the same motion, so to speak, is in all things, therefore he names Him the spotless mirror, that thereby there might be understood to be no unlikeness of the Son to the Father. As for what are said by some, according to the likeness or copying by a disciple of his master, that they are done in corporeal matter by the Son after having been previously outlined <sup>3</sup> by the Father in spiritual substances—how can these things be appropriate, when in the Gospel the Son is said not to do like things but to do the same things in like manner ?

John, Tome xiii. 36, p. 246. He says this in thanksgiving concerning God. . . . Perhaps for this reason He is the image of the invisible God, for the will in Him is an image of the primary will.

Romans, Book III. 2, p. 506. Only our Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ is justified in the sight of the Father, because ' whatsoever the Father doeth, these also the Son doeth in like manner.'

vv. 22-23. Tertullian, Praxeas, 16. The Father has committed all judgment to the Son from the beginning—no time is excepted ; e.g. the Deluge—Babel—Sodom.

<sup>1</sup> Deformatur.

<sup>2</sup> Wisdom vii. 26.

<sup>3</sup> Deformata.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies, ii. 28. Heading 'That He is to come as Judge.'

III. 33. 'That the Father judges nothing, but the Son does so. And the Father is not honoured by him by whom the Son is not honoured.'

**Origen**, Celsus viii. 9, p. 749. From God it has been granted Him to be honoured. . . . For the prophecies before His birth established His honour. But also the wonders done by Him, not as Celsus thinks, by jugglery, but by divinity foretold by the Prophets, had their witness from God; that he who honours the Son who is the Word, doing nothing irrational in so doing, may derive profit from honouring Him, and honouring Him who is Truth may become the better by honouring Truth, and also from honouring Wisdom and Righteousness and all things which the divine Scriptures say the Son of God is. . . . The honour to the Son of God is paid by a sound<sup>1</sup> life; so is that to God the Father.

**Jeremiah**, Hom. v. 8, p. 154. The righteous man honours the Son even as he honours the Father.

**John**, Tome xx. 38 (30), p. 359. This verse forms an objection to referring 'There is one that seeketh and judgeth' (viii. 50, q.v.) to the Father. But see v. 30.

**Romans**, Book II. 5, p. 481. What honour is due from man to all these virtues (Righteousness, Holiness, Truth), we are taught in the Gospels when the Lord says 'That all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.' He therefore honours the Father and the Son, who pays due honour and devotion<sup>2</sup> to wisdom and righteousness and truth and all the other things which Christ is said to be.

<sup>1</sup> ὑγιής.

<sup>2</sup> Studium.



VII. 10, p. 607. As He is Himself both Victim and Priest and is Himself both in the form of a servant and in the form of God, so He is Himself both Advocate and Judge.

Eusebius, *Prophetic Selections*, i. 3. Abraham, knowing this, worships Him and says to Him alone without the others, 'Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?'

v. 24. Clement, *Paed.* I, vi. 28, 5. The Lord Himself revealed most clearly the equality of salvation, saying 'This is the will of My Father, that every one who beholdeth the Son and believeth in Him may have. . . ' He by 'the last day' figured this world. As faith is the perfection of learning,<sup>1</sup> He therefore says 'He that believeth in the Son hath eternal life.' If then we who have believed have life, what remains beyond the possession of eternal life?

vv. 25-26. Tertullian, *Resurrection of Flesh*, 37. What is dead except the flesh? What is the voice of God, except the Word? or what is the Word, except Spirit? Rightly will He raise the flesh, because *He* was made it; and from death, which He suffered.

Novatian, *Trinity*, 14. If Christ is only a man, how 'as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself,' whereas a man cannot have life in himself after the example of God the Father, since he is not glorious in eternity, but made in matter of mortality?

Methodius, *Resurrection*, III. xxi. 4. Bonwetsch, 279. The dead who hear the Lord's voice and rise from the graves, some going to Paradise, others to judgment, are no other than our dead bodies. . . . As Origen holds

<sup>1</sup> μάθησις.

the dead and risen who hear the voice of the Son of God, to be such as have sinned after believing, and receive life in the remission of sins, we say 'How then did Christ say, if He should have given remission to those who had not kept His commandment, Matt. vii. 22; xxv. 41?' The dead therefore who hear God's voice and go into life, are not souls but our fallen bodies.

*v.* 27. **Tertullian**, *Praxeas*, 21. (Distinction between Father and Son.) Because He is Son of Man, viz. through the flesh; as also He is Son of God, through His Spirit.

**Origen**, *John*, i. 35, p. 41. The Son is righteousness; He has received authority to do judgment because He is Son of Man, and will judge the world in righteousness.

**Paul of Samosata** (Cramer's *Catena*) had the usual connection, 'Gave Him to do judgment, because He is Son of Man.'

(The other construction, 'because He is Son of Man, marvel not because of this', is Nicene or Post-Nicene.)

*vv.* 28-29. **Tertullian**, *Resurrection of Flesh*, 37. No one will be able to interpret the dead who are in the tombs as anything else than bodies and flesh, because tombs themselves are nothing else than receptacles<sup>1</sup> of corpses; since these very 'old men,' i.e. sinners, dead through ignorance of God, who the heretics argue are to be understood by tombs, are clearly declared to be going to come forth from the tombs for judgment. But how can tombs come forth from tombs?

**Hippolytus**, *Daniel*, iv. 56 (on *Dan.* xii. 2). 'Some to resurrection of life,' receiving their bodies pure and clear and shining . . . others to resurrection of judgment, receiving them sufficient<sup>2</sup> for eternal punishment . . .

<sup>1</sup> 'Stabula.'

<sup>2</sup> αὐτάρκη.

for indeed the Lord in the Gospel says Matt. xiii. 43; *Isaiah* says (Eph. v. 14); and the Lord again, John v. 25, 29. They shall arise to life, who have believed the real life and have been written in the book of life.

*vv.* 31-32. *Origen*, Numbers, Hom. xii. 1, 312. The Son is distinct from the Father, not identical; as He Himself says in the Gospels, 'There is Another who bears witness of me—the Father'.

*Cyprian*, Epistle lxvi. 2. The Lord Himself teaches and says that if any one stands up as witness to himself, his witness is not true—because every one certainly favours himself, and no one brings forward things hostile or opposed to himself; but there is clear confidence of the truth, <sup>1</sup> if in what is declared of us, another declares and witnesses. . . . If the Lord Himself who is hereafter to judge all things, thus would not that He should be believed by His own witness, but preferred to be approved by the judgment and witness of God the Father, how much more ought His servants to regard (*observare*) this, who by the judgment and testimony of God are not only approved, but also glory (or 'are glorified').

*Adamantius*, ii. 14, p. 829. An unknown person speaking about himself is not worthy of credit, as Christ Himself said. For we need not believe any chance person speaking about himself. (Hence the value of the witness of the Prophets.)

*v.* 35. *Tertullian*, Jews, 9. Christ coming to fulfil the Prophets, says to the Jews 'He was a lamp burning and shining'; he not only prepared His ways in the wilderness, but by pointing out the Lamb of God he enlightened the minds of men by his proclamation, that they might

<sup>1</sup> Sincera fides veritatis.



understand Him to be the Lamb which Moses declared would suffer. This fulfilled Ps. cxxxii. 17.

**Origen**, Leviticus, Hom. xiii. 2, p. 254. Israel had as a lamp the word of the Law and the Prophets, shut up in narrow walls, unable to shed light upon the world. But when the Sun of Righteousness, our Lord and Saviour, arose . . . the light of the knowledge of God was shed through the whole world. That the word of the Law and the Prophets is called a lamp, the Lord Himself taught us, saying of John the Baptist, John v. 35. Elsewhere He says, 'the Law and the Prophets were until John'. Therefore John, in whom the Law and the Prophets are concluded, was a burning light.

**Joshua**, Hom. xiv. 2, p. 430. John was a burning lamp because he was an angel of light (or 'a messenger of the light' <sup>1</sup>).

*vv.* 36-37. **Tertullian**, Praxeas, 21. (Distinction of Son from Father.) Saying, 'Ye have never either heard voice of Him nor seen form', He confirms again that it was not the Father but the Son who was seen and heard in the past.

So **Synod of Antioch** (Routh, ii. 472.)

**Hippolytus**, Heresies, v. 8 (3)—used by *Naassenes*.

*vv.* 39-41. **Irenæus**, IV. xx. 1, H.; IV. x. 1, p. 239, M. Well then does John record the Lord saying to the Jews, *vv.* 39-40. How then did the Scriptures testify of Him, unless they were from one and the same Father, premonishing men of the Advent of His Son, and foretelling the salvation that comes from Him? 'For if ye believed Moses ye would believe Me, for he wrote of Me,' viz. because the Son of God is sown everywhere in his writings, at one time talking with

<sup>1</sup> Angelus lucis.

Abraham and about to eat with him ; at another with Noah, giving him measurements ; at another seeking Adam ; bringing judgement upon Sodom ; appearing to Jacob and directing him on his way ; talking with Moses from the Bush. The number of cases in which the Son of God is shown by Moses cannot be told.

*vv.* 39-40 ; *vv.* 45-47. **Cyprian**, *Testimonies*, i. 18. Heading ' That another Prophet like Moses is promised, viz. one who should give a new covenant ; and who ought to be the more heard.

(Many comments on *v.* 39 *ἐρᾶννᾶτε τὰς γραφάς* do not make it clear whether it was taken as indicative or imperative. The following seem clear.)

**Origen**, *First Principles*, iv. 3, 5 (19), p. 181. (*Philocalia*, i. 21.) He who reads must, carefully observing the Saviour's ordinance <sup>1</sup> which says ' Search the Scriptures,' examine when the literal meaning is true and when it is impossible.

**Celsus**, iii. 33, p. 468. Those who have cared to mount up from mere faith and search the mind that is in the divine Scriptures according to the suggestion <sup>2</sup> of Jesus who said ' Search the Scriptures '. . . .

*v.* 16, p. 589. Who will not attend to the search of the Scriptures although Jesus said, ' Search the Scriptures.'

*vi.* 37, p. 660. Those who have devoted their whole life according to Jesus' commandment, to searching the Scriptures.

**Joshua**, *Hom.* xix. 4, p. 441. If you are mindful of the Saviour's precept in which He says, Search the Scriptures.

**Isaiah**, *Hom.* ii, p. 109. Would that we all did what is written, Search the Scriptures.

<sup>1</sup> *πρόσταγμα.*

<sup>2</sup> *ὑποθήκας.*

Luke, Hom. xxxi. Methodius, Horseleech, Bonwetsch, p. 330. The Lord Himself commands us not to be idle nor in any way to let oneself drift, saying in reference to searching in the Scripture, 'Search the Scripture, for in it ye have eternal life.'

Eusebius, Prophetic Selections, iv. 27. The Saviour's commandment which says, 'Search the Scriptures.'

(For the imperative cp. also the rendering of Codex Bezae, 'Scrutate'.)

The following are more doubtful :

Tertullian, Prescription of Heretics, 8.

Origen, John, Tome vi. 20 (12), p. 121. The Saviour, referring us to the Scriptures, says John v. 39. He refers us not to this or that Scripture, but to all.

v. 43. Irenæus, v. 25, 3 (4), p. 323. By the 'other' He means Antichrist, since he is alien from the Lord.

Tertullian, Praxeas, 21. As the Son was always in the Name of God and the King and Lord Almighty and Most High.

Cyprian, Testimonies, ii. 5. That the Saviour is the angel of God (in accordance with Exod. xxiii. 20f, 'My Name is in Him').

v. 44. Origen, Prayer, 19, 2, p. 228. It is right for us, remembering this verse, to despise all glory which is among men, even though it be thought to come on good terms,<sup>1</sup> and to seek the proper<sup>2</sup> and true glory which comes from Him alone who glorifies him who is worthy of glory in a way becoming to Himself, above the desert of him who is glorified.

v. 45. Origen, Romans, Book III. 11, p. 519. He then who does not believe Christ, of whom Moses wrote in

<sup>1</sup> ἐπὶ τῷ καλῷ.

<sup>2</sup> κυρίαν.



the Law, overthrows the Law; but he who believes Christ, of whom Moses wrote, confirms the Law through faith, because he believes in Christ.

v. 46f. Irenæus, IV. iii. 1, H.; IV. ii. 3, p. 229, M. That the writings of Moses are words of Christ, He Himself says to the Jews, as John has recorded in his Gospel v. 46-47. If those of Moses, undoubtedly also those of the rest of the prophets are His own words.

Origen, Celsus ii. 4, p. 389. Why is it strange, as Celsus' Jew says, that the beginning of our doctrine, i.e. the Gospel, is the Law? since our Lord Himself says to those who believed Him not, John v. 46-47.

Witch of Endor, 6, p. 494. Moses preaches that He will visit mankind: so that it is well said by our Lord and Saviour, John v. 46-47.

Jeremiah, Hom. ix. 2, p. 178. The curse of Jer. xi. 1 comes on those who reject Christ. By not believing in Him, they are shown not to believe even in Moses.

John, Tome xiii. 26, p. 237. See on John iv. 25.

Romans, Book IV. 4, p. 528. He will seem, as He said of Himself 'He that believeth in Me, believeth also in Him who sent Me,' so to say of Moses 'If ye believed Moses ye would believe Me also.' But in this verse He charges those with unbelief who while they do not believe Him show themselves also not to believe the writings of Moses, where by prophecy the coming of Christ is embraced.

## XXIX

A. MATT. iv. (12) 17; MARK i. (14) 15; LUKE iv. (14) 15

v. 17. Origen, Joshua, Hom. xi. 3, p. 425. At the time of His coming it was already the end of the world; but He has held down and kept back the day of the consummation.

**Possinus'** Catena on Matthew. The Kingdom of Heaven is Christ, and a virtuous life.

Romans, Book V. 3, p. 555. (The kingdom is future.) The Lord Himself at the beginning of His preaching says not 'The Kingdom of Heaven hath come', but 'the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand' (hath drawn nigh). The present time is not so much of the Kingdom as of a war through which the future Kingdom is sought.

Luke, Hom. xxxii. When He had conquered the three recorded Temptations, notice the carefulness of the Scriptures concerning the Spirit. 'In the power' is added, because of the Athlete Who had conquered.

The Lord not only spoke then in the congregations of the Jews, but speaks now in this congregation. He teaches in the whole world, seeking instruments by which to teach. Jesus is now more glorified by all than He was when He was known only in one province.

#### B. LUKE iv. 16-30

**Irenæus**, H. IV. xxxvii. 1, H.; IV. xxiii. 1, p. 260, M. The Lord read in Capernaum the prophecies of Isaiah (v. 18); showing Himself to be foretold by the prophecy of Isaiah, He said v. 21.

**Origen**, Luke Hom. xxxii. It was not by chance that He unrolled the book and found a passage prophesying of Himself; but it was part of God's providence.

'The poor,' i.e. the Gentiles. They were poor, possessing nothing, neither God nor Law nor prophets nor righteousness and the other virtues.

'Deliverance to the captives': we were captives whom Satan had bound so many years.

'Sight to the blind': the blind see, by His word and the preaching of His doctrine.

‘ Set at liberty the bruised ’ : Who is so bruised and crushed as man, who is set free and healed by Jesus ?

‘ Preach the acceptable year of the Lord ’ : Literally they say the Lord preached in Judæa one year. (But this ‘ year ’ may lie in the future.)

Now, if you will, in this assembly your eyes can be fastened upon the Saviour—when you direct the chief gaze of your heart to wisdom and truth, and to contemplate the Only Begotten of God.

Hom. xxxiii. In Capernaum, as far as the history goes, Jesus had not yet stayed or done any miracle. Hence there must be some mystery here; Nazareth being a figure of the Jews, Capernaum of the Gentiles. The time will come when the people of the Jews will say, ‘ Whatever signs and wonders I have heard done in Capernaum among the Gentiles, do also among us in Thy own country. . . . Preach the word to thy people Israel, that at least when the fulness of the Gentiles has entered, all Israel may be saved.’

The ‘ own country ’ of all the prophets is the people of the circumcision. They did ‘ not receive ’ the prophets and their prophecies ; but the nations who were far away from the prophets and had no knowledge of them, received the prophecy of Jesus Christ.

When Elijah was to work some miracle, he left the many widows in Israel and went to a Gentile widow at Sarepta of Sidon ; a figure of the future, that when a famine would oppress, not of bread or of water, but of hearing the words of the Lord, He comes to the widow of whom the prophet said, ‘ More are the children of the deserted than of her who hath a husband ’, multiplying her food and sustenance.

To this very day there are many lepers in Israel according to the flesh. See them covered with leprosy, apart



from the spiritual Elisha, our Lord and Saviour ; while thou art thyself cleansed by the Sacrament of Baptism.

Jeremiah, Frag, lviii. p. 307 (on Jer. xxxviii. 23–24). Matthew says from Isaiah, ‘to proclaim release to the captives’. Not historically ; but he redeemed us from Nebuchadnezzar who held all men—i.e. the devil.

John, Tome i. 11, p. 13. The Lord does not scorn the poor in soul, for He preaches the Gospel to them, as He Himself testifies, reading Isa. lxi. 1f, and saying while all were gazing on Him, ‘This day is the Scripture fulfilled in your ears.’

Matthew (Latin), § 99, p. 906. (Why so great a multitude to take the Lord?) Perhaps some of them had heard how once, when He was to be hurled from the brow of the mountain, He escaped the hands of those who held Him, not by simple human flight, but by some other beyond human nature.

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, ix. 10, p. 442, on Isa. lxi. 1f. Our Saviour and Lord is shown by this Scripture to have been anointed more excellently than the priests of old ; not with manufactured oil, nor by men, like the rest, but with the divine Spirit of His God and Father. . . .

He preached the Gospel to the poor, cp. Matt. v. 1–3, gave sight to not a few blind, not only of bodily eyes, but also to those blind in soul ; and freed those who were bound by the invisible fear of demons.

Similarly, Prophetic Selections, iv. 31 ; on Ps. lxxxiv. (lxxxv), 2, and xcv (xcvi), 5 and on Isaiah i. 27. Liberation from captivity means the turning of souls from error to the true knowledge of God. He said this, teaching that He Himself is the true Redeemer of human souls.

v. 19. Irenæus, II. xxxii. 6f, H.; II. xxii. 1, p. 146, M. The Valentinians say the Lord preached for one

year after His Baptism, and endeavour to confirm this from prophecy—‘ the accepted year of the Lord ’. Isa. lxi. 2, quoted Luke iv. 19.

Irenæus replies that as the ‘ day of vengeance ’ is not one of twelve hours, neither is this ‘ year ’ of twelve months. They themselves acknowledge that the prophets said much in parable and allegory, not literally. The ‘ acceptable year ’ is the time in which those are called by Him, who believe in Him and become acceptable to God ; i e. the whole time from His Advent to the consummation.

Irenæus shows from the Gospels that three Passovers are mentioned. The Lord must have been over forty to justify John viii. 56–57.

Clement, Strom. I. xxi. 145, 3, however, takes these words, both from the Prophet and the Gospel, as showing that Christ must have preached for one year only.

Origen inclines to this (Luke, Hom. xxxii. above, and Leviticus, Hom. ix. 5, p. 239). He was for a whole year with the people, that year of which He Himself says, ‘ He sent Me to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of remission.’

Eusebius, on Isa. xxix. 1, is uncertain. Here seems to be indicated the time of the preaching of salvation, in which the Saviour sojourning . . . preached the acceptable year of the Lord and the day of vengeance. And perhaps a second year, nay perhaps a third He seems to have lived with them.

Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 9. If Elisha, the Creator’s prophet, cleansed but one leper, even Naaman the Syrian, out of so many Israelite lepers, he does not do this in distinction from Christ as if He were better in this respect, in that He, a stranger cleanses an Israelite leper, whom his own Lord could not cleanse. The

cleansing of the Syrian signifies the cleansing of the nations in Christ their light.

iv. 35. The number will not point to different Gods, for the overthrow of the Creator who cures one, and the preference of Him who cured ten. For who will doubt that more could have been healed by Him who healed one ? . . .

But with the greatest possible emphasis He assails the unbelief or pride of Israel, because when there were so many lepers there and a prophet was not lacking, yet even after this proof had been given no one had recourse to God working in the prophet.

iv. 8. At Nazareth He is noticed to have preached nothing new, until He is recorded as having been cast out on the ground of a single proverb. He cannot be believed to have been a phantom, when He admitted most violent contact, being detained and seized and dragged even to a precipice. For though He passed through the midst, yet it was after having already experienced violence and been afterwards released, viz. by the tumult being stilled, as is usual, or even by breaking through it, but not by it being eluded as if a mist, which if it had been the case would not have allowed of touch at all.

### XXX

MATT. iv. 13-16 ; LUKE iv. 31

Origen, Celsus, VI. v, p. 633. Prophesying of the coming of Jesus, who turns from the worship of idols, images and demons.

LXVI, p. 683. The Light—Jesus, who is God.

Possinus' Catena on Matthew. 'The shadow of death'—not Death itself. Sin cannot itself destroy the soul, as death the body, but can convey a shadow of it.



‘ Sprung up ’—not when we were seeking it, but shone when we were living in carelessness.

**Didascalia**, 21. ‘ Those who sat in darkness ’ refers to those of the people of Israel who believed in our Lord Jesus. Because of the blindness of the people, great darkness surrounded them. They saw Jesus, but did not know that He was the Christ, nor could understand it either from the writings of the prophets or from His own works and healings.

‘ Those who dwell in the land of the shadow of death ’ refers to those who come of heathen nations, who set their hope in the power of idols and knew not God.

**Eusebius**, Gospel Demonstration, vii. 1, pp. 339–40. Isa. ix. 1–2 predicts those who from the Gentiles have believed in the Christ of God, and also the disciples and apostles of the Saviour, whom he called from the land of Zabulon and Nephthali, and chose as preachers of the Gospel.

So ix. 8, pp. 438–9.

### XXXI

MARK i. 16–20 ; MATT. iv. 18–22 ; LUKE v. 1–11

**Clement**, Paed. III. x. 52, 2. The Lord bestowed on Peter the better catch, teaching him how to fish for men, as for fish, through water.

**Origen**, Celsus i. 62, p. 376. Celsus says that Jesus joined to Himself some ten or eleven infamous men, the vilest publicans and sailors. Origen replies that it is clear to those who study the Gospel accounts . . . that Jesus chose twelve Apostles, one of whom, Matthew, was a publican. Those whom Celsus confusedly calls ‘ sailors ’ are perhaps James and John, since they left their boat and their father Zebedee and followed Jesus.

For Peter and his brother Andrew, using a casting net for their necessary support, are to be counted not among sailors, but as the Scripture has related, among fishermen. . . . Jesus fulfilled His words 'Come after Me and I will make you fishers of men,' by some divine power in His Apostles. Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 4-5.

63, p. 378. (Philocalia xviii. 9.) Celsus calling the Apostles infamous men, most wicked publicans and sailors, seems to believe what is written when it suits him. . . . It is written in the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas (v. 9) whence Celsus perhaps took his saying that the Apostles were infamous and most wicked, 'Jesus chose His own apostles, men more sinful than all sin.' So, Luke v. 8; 1 Tim. i. 15. Christ showed His healing power in choosing such men, and leading them on so far as to be examples of purest character to those who through them are brought to the Gospel of Christ.

Jeremiah, Hom. xvi. 1, p. 227. If any man has considered those who have from God grace of speech woven as nets and brought together<sup>1</sup> from the Holy Scripture as a casting net, so as for the web to be cast round the souls of the hearers, and has considered that this takes place scientifically<sup>2</sup> according to the knowledge which Jesus taught, he will see in what manner our Saviour not only then but now also sends and trains fishers of men, that we may be able to come up from the sea and flee from its bitter waves. But those irrational<sup>3</sup> fish coming up by draw-nets, casting-nets, nets, or hooks, perish in death which does not give place to life; but he who is taken by Jesus' fishers and comes up from the sea, dies himself, but dies to the world,

<sup>1</sup> συγκειμένην.

<sup>2</sup> τεχνικῶς.

<sup>3</sup> ἄψυχοι.

dies to sin, and is afterwards quickened by the word of God and takes up another life; just as you might suppose the soul of the fish to change after leaving its fishy body, and to become something better than a fish. You have come up from the sea, having fallen into the nets of the disciples of Jesus; on coming forth you change your soul; you are no longer a fish dwelling among the salt waves of the sea, but forthwith your soul changes and is transformed and becomes something better and more divine than before. Cp. 2 Cor. iii. 18.

Luke (Mai, *Auctores Classici* x). He was standing by the Lake of Gennesaret, or according to Matthew and Mark was walking by the Sea of Galilee. . . . The evangelists seem to contradict. . . . But if God at the beginning of the creation of the world called the gatherings of the waters 'seas,' and rivers are also gatherings of waters, they according to this are also seas; so the most sweet and potable Lake of Gennesaret, which is now called 'Tiberias', is called in the Gospels a sea, since it also is a gathering of waters. Now Gennesaret is a country of the Canaanite district, in which the Lord coming to the parts by the sea found Peter and John and the rest, and called them after the draught of fish. They were formerly disciples of John the Baptist.

**Tertullian**, *Against Marcion*, iv. 9. Why out of so many occupations did He look to fishing, in order to call Apostles from it? saying to Peter, who was trembling because of the bountiful catch of fish, 'Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men' He implied the fulfilment of Jer. xvi. 16, 'Fish them,' i.e. men. Therefore they left their boats and followed Him, recognizing Him who had begun to do as He had foretold.



**Origen**, Possinus' Catena on Matthew. They honoured Zebedee as their father by supporting and serving him in all ways ; but left him when he acted in an ungodly way.<sup>1</sup>

**Methodius**, Horseleech, v. (Bonwetsch, p. 334). They catch men for faith in Christ, and fish them from the depth of error.

**Eusebius**, on Isa. xix. 6. They, through this teaching hunted after the souls of men, drawing them to salvation.

## XXXII

## MARK i. 21-28 ; LUKE iv. 31-38

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 7. Marcion sets Him forth as having in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius descended into Capernaum a city of Galilee, from the Creator's Heaven, into which He had first descended from His own. (Tertullian wants evidence of this descent.)

Tertullian says that His coming into the synagogue shows that He came for the lost sheep of the house of Israel. . . . How could *He* be allowed in the synagogue, who was so sudden, so unknown, of whose tribe, people, household, no one was so far informed ? Even if admission to the synagogue was indiscriminate, teaching would not be allowed except to one very well known and tried or previously approved for this, or commended from elsewhere with this gift. They were astonished at His teaching because His word was with power ; not because He was teaching against the Law and the Prophets. His divine speech showed power and grace, building up rather than destroying the substance of the Law and the prophets. . . .

<sup>1</sup> ἀσεβήσαντα.

How did the daemon know Him to have this name, if no message about Him had ever yet come from His God hitherto unknown and silent? . . . He remembered that the prophet had predicted the Holy One of God; and Jesus, the Lord's Name, was that of the Son of Nave ('Nun'). . . . Though a daemon, he had some perception of the Lord's disposition. He said, 'What have we to do with Thee?' displaying himself and lamenting his lot, with which in view he added, 'Thou hast come to destroy us.' Thus he recognized Jesus as Son of the Judge and Avenger, and so to speak, severe God, not of that very good God (of Marcion's), who knows not to destroy and punish. . . . Jesus rebuked him as envious, and wanton even in his confession, and flattering in a wrong way, as if it would be Christ's highest glory, if He had come to destroy daemons and not rather to save men. . . . Or why did He rebuke him? If for speaking altogether falsely, then He was not Jesus nor the Holy One of God at all; if for speaking partly false, because he had thought Him Jesus and the Holy One of God, but of God the Creator, he was most unjustly rebuked (because unable to have known better).

**Origen** (Possinus' Catena on Mark). Why was it that the daemon said, not 'Thou art holy' but 'Thou art the Holy One,' with the addition of the article? That he might show that while there are many holy, there is but one Holy One, the Lord. But Christ silences him that we may learn that it is right to silence the daemons even if they say the truth.

**Eusebius**, on Ps. xc. (xci), 9f. They had learnt who He was by the voice borne to Him from heaven; yea moreover they knew His power by what He had wrought at the time of the Temptation.

## XXXIII

MATT. viii. 14-17 ; MARK i. 29-34 ;  
LUKE iv. 38-41

**Origen**, John, Tome xiii. 63, p. 279. The nobleman's son was healed at the seventh hour, the centurion's servant and Peter's wife's mother before evening, many demoniacs and sick when evening had come. So some are healed by Jesus later and others sooner ; those in the evening are later, being worse <sup>1</sup> than those healed during the day.

Luke (Nicetas' Catena, fragment in Mai, Gallandi, Corderius). They brought them about sunset, or after the day was over ; either being ashamed, or fearing the Pharisees, or busied about other things, or perhaps supposing that it was not lawful to heal on the Sabbath. For the evangelist noted that He was teaching them on the Sabbath. Therefore it was at about sunset their relatives brought them who were sick and He healed them. (Best text in Mai, Auctores Classici, x.)

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 8. They were bidden to be silent because Christ wished Himself to be recognized as Son of God by man, not by unclean spirits. . . . It was fitting for Him who had abundance of holy ones to spurn the proclamation of an unclean spirit. But He who had never been foretold, if yet He wanted to be recognized—but He would have come in vain if He did not want this—would not have spurned the witness of an alien being of any kind. (Christ here showed also that He was to be feared, whereas Marcion denies that his God is feared.)

. . . . He is the Christ of Isaiah, the Healer of sicknesses ; He takes away (aufert) our weaknesses, and

<sup>1</sup> ἐλάττονας.



bears (portat) our sicknesses. The Greeks are wont to use 'portare' <sup>1</sup> (bear) in the sense of 'tollere'—'take away.'

## XXXIV

MARK i. 35-39 ; LUKE iv. 42-44

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 8. A region of this kind is usual with the Creator. It was right that the Word should appear there in body, where He had once wrought in the cloud. The character of the place which had been approved for the Law, was suitable also for the Gospel.

'Kingdom of God.' (He had made known no other God than the Creator, nor did His hearers know of any.)

## MATTHEW iv. 23

**Origen**, on 1 Cor. i. 26. (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. ix. 237.) He was mighty according to the Spirit, healing every sickness and every disease among the people.

## XXXV

MATT. viii. 1-4 ; MARK i. 40-45 ; LUKE v. 12-16

**Origen** (Gallandi, Mai, Corderius) has long note on the rite of cleansing the leper in Leviticus xiv ; also on the meaning of certain points, e.g. his having his head bare and mouth covered.

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 9. Typical meaning of the Law. By its regulation of not touching a leper but removing him from all intercourse, it forbade communion to a man defiled by sin, so as to avoid contagion from him. The Lord wanting to show that the Law should be understood more deeply, signifying

<sup>1</sup> βαστάζειν.

spiritual things through fleshly, and therefore not destroying it but building up what He wanted to be more exactly known, touched the leper. Man might be defiled by this, but not God, Who is incapable of defilement; so it will not be prescribed to Him that He ought to have observed the Law and not touched the unclean, for contact with the unclean would not defile Him. . . . Marcion's Christ could not be defiled, being a mere phantom. . . .

(Marcion draws a marked distinction between Christ's cleansing here and Elisha's cleansing of Naaman; e.g. Elisha used matter, even water, and that seven times; Christ, a word alone, and that once. Tertullian criticises Marcion's application.)

For the sake of avoiding human glory, He forbade the man to publish the miracle; for the sake of observance of the Law, He bade him fulfil the regulations; 'Go, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift which Moses commanded.' The Law implied by type that a man once a sinner, but now cleansed by the word of God, must offer a gift to God in the Temple; i.e. prayer and thanksgiving in the Church through Jesus Christ, the universal Priest of the Father. So He added 'that it may be to you<sup>1</sup> for a testimony'—viz. by which He testified that He came not to destroy the Law but to fulfil, and that it was He Himself who was predicted as to take on Himself diseases and sicknesses.

Marcion simply says 'As good, and also as knowing that every one who was freed from leprosy would observe the rites of the Law, He commanded thus'.

Tertullian argues that in this case He came not to destroy the Law.

<sup>1</sup> Vobis.

**Origen**, *Against Celsus*, i. 48, p. 364. Jesus touched the leper spiritually <sup>1</sup> rather than sensibly ; to cleanse him in a twofold way, freeing him not only as people generally understand from his sensible leprosy by a sensible touch, but also from the other through His truly divine touch.

**John**, Tome vi. 47 (28), p. 146. (Elisha did not lay his hand upon Naaman.) For to lay his hand on leprosy and cleanse it was the work of My Lord Jesus alone, Who did not only say to him who asked with faith, ' If Thou wilt Thou canst cleanse me,' the word ' I will, be thou cleansed ; ' for besides the word He also touched him, and he was cleansed from his leprosy.

v. 4. **Clement**, *Hypotyposes*, Frag. 12. (Stählin) He healed the leper and said, ' Show thyself to the priests for a testimony '—on account of the following tradition. The priests had a custom, by the power of God, of healing lepers on appointed days. Having not, for a long time, been able to heal this leper, they said ' None will heal this one, save only the Christ, if He come.' Therefore the Saviour, when He healed the leper, roused with compassion at his strong entreaty, said ' Go and show thyself to the priests for a testimony ' ;—i.e. that if this man has been cured, of whom you have said ' None will heal him, save only the Christ,' then the Christ has come ; believe ye Him.

**Origen**, *John*, Tome ii. 34 (28), p. 88. As the cleansed leper, offering the gift commanded by Moses, did this as a testimony to those who had not believed on Christ ; so the martyrs (witnesses) and all the saints whose works shine before men, witness for a testimony to unbelievers.

<sup>1</sup> νοητῶς.



**Cyprian**, Epistles, iii. 2. Our Lord . . . preserved their honour for the pontiffs (chief priests) and priests, although they had preserved neither fear of God nor knowledge of Christ. By the humility wherewith He taught us also to be humble, He still called him a priest whom he knew to be profane.<sup>1</sup>

**Didascalia**, 26. He said this in order to show that He does not destroy the Law, but teaches what the Law is and what is the traditional observance<sup>2</sup> of the Law.

**Eusebius**, Gospel Demonstration, viii. 2, p. 401. Christ considered that the rites of the Law ought still to be performed—in the Temple as in a holy place worthy of God.

## XXXVI

MATT. ix. 1-8; MARK ii. 1-12; LUKE v. 17-26

**Irenæus**, V. xvii. 1f, p. 313f, M. God gave His commandment to man by the Word. 'Adam heard the voice of the Lord God.' Rightly therefore does His Word say to man, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee,' He against whom we had sinned in the beginning giving in the end remission of sins. . . .

When the paralytic was healed 'the people seeing this, glorified God Who had given such power unto men.' What God did they glorify? not the unknown Father invented by heretics, but Him who was preached by Law and Prophets, who is the Father of our Lord; therefore He taught men by the evidence of their senses, by the signs which He did, to give glory to God. If He had come from one Father and the people glorified another, He would have made them ungrateful to the Father Who had wrought the cure. But since

<sup>1</sup> Sacrilegium.

<sup>2</sup> δευτέρωσις.

from the actual God His only Son had come to save men, and through the mighty works which He did was calling unbelievers to give glory to the Father ; He said to the Pharisees who did not receive the Advent of His Son, and therefore did not believe the remission which came to pass through Him, ' that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power to forgive sins ;' and having said this, He commanded the paralytic to take up the bed on which he lay and go to his house ; confounding the unbelievers by what He effects, and showing that He is the voice of God through which the man received commandments which he transgressed and is become a sinner ; for paralysis followed upon sins. Therefore forgiving sins, He both healed the man and manifestly showed who He Himself was. For if none can forgive sins save God only, but the Lord forgave them and healed men, it is clear that He was the Word of God become Son of Man, receiving from the Father the power of remitting sins, as Man and as God ; that while sympathizing with us as Man, He might as God show mercy upon us and forgive us our debts, which we owe to God our Maker.

**Tertullian**, Chastity, 22. Christ showed His power (to forgive) by declaring the secrets of the heart. If He cared so much to prove His power as to disclose <sup>1</sup> thoughts and so command healing, lest He might be believed not able to forgive sins, I may not without the same proofs believe the same power to exist in any one. (Against claims of martyrs to pardon sins.)

Against Marcion, iv. 10. Fulfilment of Isa. xxxv. 2-7, where ' Be strong, fear not ' promises along with restoration of limbs also restitution of strength, ' Arise,

<sup>1</sup> Traducere.

take up thy bed ;' and also vigour of mind so as not to fear those who would say ' Who shall forgive sins but God only ' ? . . . Recognize also in the same prophet Christ as Forgiver of sins. Isa. liii. 11-12 ; i. 18, also Micah vii. 18-19.

(On title ' Son of Man. ') Christ could not speak falsely, so as to call Himself Son of Man if He were not so ; nor can He be son of man who is not born of man, either father or mother ; if not from human father, it must be from mother, i.e. from a virgin. Otherwise there will be two fathers, God and man.

Tertullian does not understand on what principle Marcion admits Him ' Son of Man. ' ' If of a human father, you deny Him to be Son of God ; if also of God, you make Christ like the fabled Hercules ; if His mother alone is human, you grant my Christ ; if of neither human father nor mother, He is son of no man, and must have spoken falsely. Tertullian refers to Dan. vii. 13 ; iii. 25. When the Jews, regarding Him only as man, and not yet certain that He was God, quâ Son of God, considered rightly that no man could forgive sins but God alone, why did He not answer them according to their view of man, that He had power of forgiving sins, since naming the Son of Man He also named Man ? except that He wanted by the title ' Son of Man ' to impress them by the passage in Daniel, to show there was also a Man who could forgive sins—because only the Son of Man in this prophecy of Daniel had obtained power of judging and therewith also of forgiving sins—so that, remembering the Scriptures, they might more easily recognize Him to be the Son of Man by this very forgiveness of sins. He first declared Himself Son of Man in the place where He first forgave sins, i.e. in which He first judged while He absolved.



**Origen**, Matthew in loc. (Possinus' Catena.) Three paralytics were brought to Christ on different occasions. What is related on the other two occasions is very similar to this case.

**Numbers**, Hom. xxiv. 1, p. 363. His sacrifice was such as to suffice for the salvation of the whole world. For others forgave sins with prayers, but He alone with authority. For He said, 'Son, thy sins are forgiven thee.'

**Canticles**, Hom. ii. 4, p. 19. 'Bed' is not to be taken literally, but of the man's powerless body, on which he was lying before being healed, which was afterwards strengthened by the power of God. The Son of God had not come down from heaven to earth to give commands about beds and not to allow a man rising from his sickness to get up without his bed.

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer, iv. God hears not the voice, but the heart, nor is He to be reminded with loud cries, who sees the thoughts, as the Lord proves, saying 'Why think ye evil in your hearts?'

**Rebaptism**, 18. The Lord said this to show that by faith hearts are cleansed to obtain remission of sins.

### XXXVII

MATT. ix. 9-13, 14-17; MARK ii. 13-17, 18-22;  
LUKE v. 27-32, 33-39

**Origen**, Matthew in loc. (Possinus). Mark and Luke conceal his name, using a former appellation. But Matthew discloses his own name. He says this that we admiring the skill of God who healed him, may believe in Him more perfectly.

**Celsus**, I. lxii, p. 376. Levi (Lebes) the publican who followed Jesus was not of the number of His Apostles,

except in some of the copies of the Gospel according to Mark.<sup>1</sup>

**Eusebius**, Gospel Demonstration iii. 5, p. 119. No other evangelist relates that Matthew was a publican; Matthew himself pillories his own life and becomes his own accuser.

IX. 8, p. 439. You will find in the Gospel Matthew called from Galilee and in another (Gospel or place?) again Levi.

**Origen**, Matthew, Book XIV. 15, p. 636. Matthew did not merely follow, but *arose* and followed. 'Arose' is an important addition. There are always many who follow, as many multitudes, without arising to follow, nor leaving all their former things; but few who arise and follow. . . .

**Barnabas**, v. 9. 'I came not to call righteous but sinners' is exemplified in the choice of His own Apostles who were to preach His Gospel; men who were sinners above all sin.<sup>2</sup>

**Clement**, ii. 1f. This means that He must save those who are perishing. This is great and marvellous, to establish not the things which are standing but those which are falling; so Christ willed to save what were perishing, and He saved many, coming and calling us when already perishing.

**Justin**, Apology, i. 15. For the Heavenly Father wills the repentance of the sinner rather than his punishment.

<sup>1</sup> (Origen seems to have read *Λευῆς* or *Λεβῆς* in iii. 18, for Lebbaeus, the Western reading; see Westcott and Hort. He clearly distinguishes Levi from Matthew the publican whom he has just mentioned as an apostle. They are also distinguished by Heracleon—Clement, Strom, iv. 71—and Clement, Rich Man, 13.

<sup>2</sup> ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους.

**Resurrection, 8.** If, as the opponents of Resurrection say, the flesh is a sinner, <sup>1</sup> the Saviour came simply for the sake of this, as He says: 'I came not to call righteous but sinners.'

**Clement, Paed. I. ix. 83, 2.** As those who are healthy do not need a physician, in so far as they are strong, while those who are sick need his skill; so also we who are sick in our life with most shameful lusts and blame-worthy excesses <sup>2</sup> and the other inflammations of passions, need the Saviour.

**Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 11.** Marcion argues from the publican called by our Lord, as if a stranger to the Law and an alien from Judaism, chosen by an adversary of the Law. . . Tertullian replies that Christ approves the Jews by saying that a physician is needed not by the whole but by the sick. Meaning by 'sick' Gentiles and publicans, whom He was calling, He was setting up the Jews as whole. If so, He did ill in coming down to destroy the Law, as though to remedy bad health, while those who lived in it were well. How is it that he put forward the example of a physician without fulfilling it? for no man brings a physician to the healthy, nor to such strangers as man is to Marcion's God.

**Origen, Celsus iii. 59f, p. 486f.** Celsus declares that the Christians call all manner of criminals, while those who call to other rites and promise cleansing from sins invite the pure and just. Origen replies that it is not the same thing to call the sick in soul to healing and to call the healthy to the knowledge of diviner things. We at first calling men to be healed exhort sinners to come to the words which teach not to

<sup>1</sup> ἁματωλός.

<sup>2</sup> ἀκρασίας.



sin ; and those who are without understanding to the words which implant understanding. . . . After they have advanced, we call them to our mysteries.<sup>1</sup>

There are in the divinity of the Word some helps which heal those who are sick, concerning whom the Word said, Matt. ix. 12 ; but others which afford to those who are pure in soul and body the revelation of mystery, Rom. xvi. 25-26. Celsus says that we say that God was sent to sinners. . . . It is as if he found fault with any people saying that a physician has been sent by a most kindly king because of those who are ill in the city. God the Word was sent as a physician to sinners, but as a teacher of divine mysteries to those already pure and no longer sinning. Celsus being unable to distinguish asks ' Why was He not sent to the sinless ? what hurt is there in not having sinned ? ' If by sinless he means those who sin no longer, our Saviour Jesus was sent to these also, but not as a physician.

Psalm xxvii (xxviii), 3, p. 637. God draws the just along with the sinners, and because of the sinners and workers of iniquity, that they may be saved. Those who did not know this mystery accused Jesus, saying ' Thou eatest and drinkest with sinners '. But He was far from being hurt by them, and came to help them. So, if any disciple of Christ does this. Yet if any without due preparation and without strength falls into such a danger as being with sinners and workers of iniquity, he not only will not help them, but will also destroy himself. . . . Our Saviour was with sinners and with a harlot, yet not one who spoke words of peace but had evil in her heart.

Cyprian, Epistle lv. 16. (We ought to have mercy upon the penitent.) How can he exercise the healing

<sup>1</sup> τελετάς.

art who says 'I cure only the whole, by whom a physician is not needed?' We ought to furnish our help, our healing, to the wounded.

So, lxxviii. 4.

**Didascalia**, 7. Therefore approach and associate with those who are convicted of sins and in evil case; take care of them, encourage and restore them.

**Eusebius**, Gospel Demonstration, iv. 10, p. 163. He came preaching to all (both Israel and the Gentiles) knowledge and friendship to His Father, promising deliverance and forgiveness of their former ignorance and sins. This He also clearly proclaimed, saying, Mark ii. 17.

iv, 13, p. 168. In the end He presented Himself as a Benefactor and Saviour to all, both evil and ungodly, both Greeks and Jews, because of the exceeding kindness and humanity of the all-good Father; proclaiming this expressly, Mark ii. 17.

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 11. If John had rendered no service by crying, according to Isaiah, in the wilderness and preparing the Lord's way by denunciation and by praise of repentance; if He had not baptized Him among others; no one would have called Christ's disciples, eating and drinking, to the precedent of John's disciples, constantly fasting and praying. If a difference existed between Christ and John and the followers<sup>1</sup> of each, there would be no carrying out of the comparison, or point in the appeal. Therefore Christ belonged to John, and John to Christ, and both to the Creator; both were preachers and teachers of the Law and the Prophets. As it was, by gently giving a reason, that the sons of the bridegroom could not fast while the bridegroom

<sup>1</sup> Græc.

was with them, promising that they would fast afterwards when the Bridegroom would be taken from them, He did not defend but rather excused His disciples, as criticized not without reason ; nor did He reject John's system,<sup>1</sup> but rather granted it, establishing it for John's time so as to intend it for His own time. (Christ is meant by the bridegroom in Ps. xviii (xix), 6-7; Isa. lxi. 10, xlix. 18. The title does not suit Marcion's God.)

**Irenæus**, I. 1, 12, H. ; I. vi. 4, p. 32, M. The Valentians regard the Bridegroom and Bride as Soter and Sophia ; <sup>2</sup> the bridechamber is the whole Pleroma.

**Tertullian**, Fasting, 2. The ' Psychics ' think those days are in the Gospel marked for fasts, on which the Bridegroom was taken away ; they regard these as the only legitimate days for Christian fasts. (Cp. 13, where Tertullian charges them with extending fasts beyond this.)

**Origen**, Leviticus, Hom. x. 2, p. 246. (Origen is spiritualizing fasting, against some who thought the Jewish fasts ought to be observed.) Let them fast who have lost the bridegroom ; we having the Bridegroom with us cannot fast. . . . We do not say this to release the bonds of Christian abstinence. We have the days of Lent (Quadragesima) consecrated to fasting ; and the fourth and sixth days of the week, on which we are wont to fast. (Much of this is probably due Rufinus the translator.) Christians are free to fast at all times.

**Didascalia**, 21. On the days of the Passion all the believers in the whole world fast ; as our Lord and Master said when they asked Him ' Why do John's disciples fast and Thine fast not ? ' . . . He is now, through His works, among us ; but from sight He is far

<sup>1</sup> Disciplinam.

<sup>2</sup> Achamoth.



away because He is risen to the height of Heaven, and sits on the right hand of the Father.

**Eusebius**, Ps. lxviii (lxix), 11. (He knew the time for fasting, that of His Passion. His words were then fulfilled.)

**Epiphanius**, Haer xlii. 2, p. 303. *Marcion* asked the presbyters the meaning of the verses (about the garment and the wineskins). Their interpretation was 'The old wineskins are the hearts of the Pharisees and Scribes, which have grown old in sins and have not received the preaching<sup>1</sup> of the Gospel ; and the old garment is even as Judas grown old in covetousness did not receive the preaching of the new and holy and heavenly mystery, that of (our) hope. Though conjoined with the eleven Apostles, and called by the Lord Himself, he made an exceeding great rent for himself, no one (or 'nothing') having caused it for him ; since his mind was not harmonious with the hope above and the heavenly calling of good things to come, instead of riches and pomp here and passing friendship of hope and pleasure.

(*Marcion* who took a completely different view, replied.) 'I will rend your church and put a rent in it for ever.'

**Irenæus**, Haer. IV, lvii. 2, H. ; IV. xxxv. 2, p. 276, M. Let them (the Valentinians) either keep themselves from the prophets, as from the old, and not say that they said something from the newness, being sent forth by the Demiurge ; or let them again be reproved by the Lord who says that new wine is not put into old wineskins.

IV. lv. 5, H. ; IV. xxxiii. 14, p. 274, M. The new wine put into new wineskins is faith which is in Christ.

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iii. 15. (On Marcion's

<sup>1</sup> κήρυγμα.

Christ appropriating the title of the Christ of the Demiurge.) How does He teach that a new patch is not sewed on an old garment, nor new wine committed to old skins, being Himself sewn and put into an old order of names? How did He tear Gospel from Law, while clothed with the whole Law, viz. bearing the name of Christ? Who prevented Him from bearing a different name, preaching a different message, coming from a different source? . . .

IV. 11. You have gone wrong in the Lord's declaration by which He seems to separate old and new. You are puffed up with old wineskins and have your head turned with new wine, and so have sewn the patch of heretical novelty in the old, i.e. the former Gospel. . . . Both the new and the old are God's. No one puts even new wine into old skins, who has not even old skins, nor does any put a new patch in an old garment, except one who has not lacked even an old garment. . . . So if the object of the parable is to show the separation of the newness of the Gospel from the oldness of the Law, He declared that that from which He was separating was also His. . . . What He separated He also showed to have been in one. . . . If we grant this separation, it is by reformation, by enlargement, by advance. As the fruit is separated from the seed, though it is fruit from the seed; so also the Gospel is separated from the Law, while it proceeds from the Law; different from it, but not alien; distinct, but not contrary.

Origen, *First Principles*, I. iii. 7, p. 63. The Holy Spirit dwells in the renewed. Christ bade new wineskins to be made, i.e. men to walk in newness of life, that they might receive the new wine, i.e. the newness of the grace of the Holy Spirit (or 'of the Holy Spirit of grace').

Leviticus, Hom. iv. 4, pp. 200-201. To a soul not yet renewed but abiding in the oldness of the letter, ought not to be entrusted the secrets of the new mysteries, which the world has come to know through Christ.

Proverbs ix. 8. (Fragment in Mai.) Christ did not rebuke His disciples when still new,<sup>1</sup> because the old skins were not fit for new wine.

Matthew (Cramer's Catena.) The old wineskins are those which have grown old<sup>2</sup> by life according to the Law; the new wine is the grace of Christ.

Adamantius, ii. 16, p. 831. Marcus, the Marcionite, says that the Saviour's words show that the new is not the fulfilment<sup>3</sup> of the old; neither Christ nor the Apostle is the fulfilment of the Law.

Admantius asks, How could the new rag be foreign to the old garment, the nature of sheep from which the wool is woven being one and the same? also the art of wool-working, which makes both old and new, is one and the same. Also both the old and the new wine is produced from the same vine.

Methodius, Resurrection, ii. 13 (Bonwetsch, p. 220). Teaching that there cannot be added to the old flesh, as they think, something new from the food; else it could happen that the one would be old in the body, the other new. So our bodies would not grow old if some flesh came in while the other came away. (Methodius is opposing the view that the particles of our bodies are constantly changing.)

Hegemonius, (Acts of Archelaus), xxi (xviii). Archelaus interprets wine and skins of soul and body. If men consist of soul and body, and not simply of body

<sup>1</sup> νέους.

<sup>2</sup> πεπαλαιωμένοι.

<sup>3</sup> πλήρωμα.



without soul, and they cannot subsist without one another, why do you call them hostile and contrary to one another? Our Lord seems to me to have spoken of them by parables. . . . New wine is to be put into new skins because the same is Lord both of the skin and of the wine; for although the substance is different, yet by Lordship and preservation and use one person consists of the two. If any one should call the body the work of an Evil being, then because it is corruptible, old, and worthless, it cannot bear the power of the spirit or movement of the soul and its most noble creation; for as if a patch of new cloth be sewn on an old garment, a greater rent is made; so also the body if joined to the nobler work, the soul, will perish.

## XXXVIII

MATT. xii. 1-8; MARK ii. 23-28; LUKE vi. 1-5

Irenæus, IV. xvii. H.; IV. viii. 3, p. 237, M. The Law did not forbid the hungry to take food on the Sabbath from what lay beside them; but it forbade to reap and gather into the barn. Therefore the Lord said to those who assailed His disciples for plucking the ears and eating, Luke vi. 3-4; excusing His disciples through the words of the Law, and signifying that it was lawful for priests to act freely. Now David had been a recognized <sup>1</sup> priest before God, though Saul was persecuting him. For all righteous men have (*Greek fragment*: 'Every righteous *king* has') priestly rank. But all the Lord's apostles are priests, who inherit here neither lands nor houses, but always serve the altar and God. Cp. the Blessing of Levi. Deut. xxxiii. 9. But who have left father and mother, and renounced all

<sup>1</sup> Scitus.

their relations, on account of the word of God and His covenant,<sup>1</sup> save the Lord's disciples ?

The Lord's disciples, having the position of the Levites, might when hungry take food from the crops.<sup>2</sup> For the labourer is worthy of his food. And the priests in the Temple used to profane the Sabbath and were not guilty. Why not ? Because when in the Temple they were performing not worldly services, but the Lord's ; fulfilling the Law, not transgressing the Law.

xix. 2, H. ix. 2, pp. 237-8, M. 'More than the Temple.' 'More' and 'less' are not used of incompatible and contrary things, with nothing in common, but of things of the same substance and in relation with one another, differing only in number and magnitude ; as water from water, light from light, and grace from grace. Therefore the legislation for liberty is greater than that for bondage ; therefore it is spread abroad not into one nation only, but into the whole world. But there is one and the same Lord, Who is more than the Temple, and more than Solomon, and gives to man more than Jonah, i.e. His own presence and resurrection from the dead ; but not changing God, or preaching another Father. . . .

Matt. xii. 7. IV. xxix. 4, H. ; xvii. 4, p. 249, M. Giving a testimony to the Prophets that they preached the truth ; but convicting (His opponents) as foolish by their own fault.

Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 12. If Christ were not proclaiming <sup>3</sup> the Lord of the Sabbath, His overthrowing the Sabbath would need no explanation. The strangeness lay in the incongruity of proclaiming God the Creator and opposing His Sabbath. . . . If Christ

<sup>1</sup> Testamentum.

<sup>2</sup> Seminibus.

<sup>3</sup> Circumferret.

overthrows the Sabbath, He has acted according to the example of the Creator in commanding the Ark to be carried on seven (*v.* 1 eight) days, including the Sabbath, round the walls of Jericho . . . cp. also Isa. i. 14. . . . The disciples had been hungry; they had on that day plucked the ears and rubbed them in their hands; by preparing food they had violated the festival. Christ excuses them and is charged with breaking the Sabbath by the Pharisees. . . . His judgement is supported by the Creator's Scripture—by the example of David entering the Temple on the Sabbath and providing food by boldly breaking the shew-bread. He remembered the original privilege of the Sabbath, freedom from fasting, secured by the double supply of manna on the previous day. So the Lord expressed the mind of the Creator; He would have overthrown both the Sabbath and the Creator if He had commanded His disciples to fast on the Sabbath. . . . He does not positively defend His disciples, but excuses them on the ground of human need; He preserves the higher honour of the Sabbath as a day not of sadness but of rest; He associates David and his companions with His disciples in fault and in indulgence; <sup>1</sup> is He then alien from the Creator?

Flesh of Christ, 15. If His flesh were not human nor from man, I do not see by what substance Christ Himself has declared Himself Man and Son of Man; 'But now ye seek to kill a man who has spoken the truth to you,' and 'The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.'

Origen, Cramer's Catena on Matthew. (The long note on *v.* 12 ascribed to Origen is really from Chrysostom.)

<sup>1</sup> Venia.



If the Temple was shown to be above the commandment, then Christ was above the Law.

Jeremiah, Frag. iv. (on vii. 21), p. 289. Scripture says 'The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit,' and 'Sacrifice the sacrifice of righteousness.' The Saviour sought to turn those who were otherwise minded, reverencing natural sacrifices. Matt. xii. 7.

Matthew (Cramer). If the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath, calling Himself also King, it is lawful for the King now to enact law about the Sabbath, now to bring the Sabbath to an end along with sacrifices and burnt offerings and the rest of the Temple service, enacting a new covenant.

Matthew, Book XIV. 20, p. 643. As the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath and not servant of the Sabbath, like the people; so He who gives the law is Lord, to give the Law 'unto the time of reformation.'

Eusebius, Ps. xxxiii (xxxiv). (The title of the Psalm may suit David's behaviour to *Ahimelech* the High Priest, as well as that to *Achish* of Gath. Abimelech may be a mistake for Achish; but probably the High Priest is meant, whom David deceived. 'Kingdoms' ['Samuel'] has Ahimelech, but the Hebrew letters Beth and Caph are easily confused, differing only by a very small projection.<sup>1</sup> [Eusebius deals with this at great length. He quotes the Gospel passage from Matthew and Mark, and asks] 'How does the Saviour speak of Abiathar, not Abimelech'? One might say that Abimelech had two names, and so is the same as Abiathar. Abiathar his son is mentioned shortly after. Or, the history speaks of Abimelech as *priest*; the Saviour of Abiathar as *High Priest* at that time. The

<sup>1</sup> κέραια.

history relates that Ahimelech and the priests of God were slain by Saul, but does not say that the High Priest was slain.

#### A. XXXIX

MATT. xii. 9-14; MARK iii. 1-6; LUKE vi. 6-11

Irenæus, V. xii. 5, p. 307, M. He whose withered hand was cured, and all whom Christ cured, did not change the members with which they were originally born, but received the very same made whole.

Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 12. The Pharisees are watching if He would heal on the Sabbath, that they might accuse Him as one who overthrew the Sabbath, not as one confessing a new God. . . . They were altogether wrong about the Sabbath Law, not noticing that it only conditionally proclaimed a holiday from works, confined to a certain class of them—'all *thy* work'—viz. human work, belonging to each man's craft or business, not divine work; the work of healing<sup>1</sup> and preserving specially belongs not to man but to God. So Exod. xii. 16. 'Thou shalt not do any work in it except what is to be done for every life (soul) i.e. with a view to deliver a life;<sup>2</sup> because God's work may be done also through a man for the saving of a life, yet by God; which the Man Christ also was to do, because also God. Therefore desiring to bring them to this understanding of the Law through the restoration of the withered hand, He asks, 'Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath or not? to deliver a life (soul) or to destroy it?'—that He might by allowing that amount of work which He was about to do for a life, remind them what

<sup>1</sup> Salutis.

<sup>2</sup> LXX Exodus xii. 16 πλὴν ὅσα ποιηθήσεται πάσῃ ψυχῇ.

works the Sabbath Law forbade, viz. human ones, and what it commanded, viz. divine, which should be done for every life (soul). He was called Lord of the Sabbath because He was keeping the Sabbath as His own possession. Had He overthrown it He would have been justified, as its Founder and therefore specially its Lord. But He does not at all repeal the Sabbath, whose Law He upheld, both above by working for the life in the case of the disciples, for He granted to the hungry the comfort of food; and now by curing the withered hand; everywhere confirming by acts 'I came not to destroy the Law but to fulfil it.' For He fulfilled the Law here also by interpreting its condition, throwing light on the difference of works, doing what the Law exempts from the holiday of the Sabbath, making the very Sabbath itself, sanctified from the beginning by His Father's blessing, more sanctified by His own blessing, viz. by supplying divine safeguards.

Novatian, Trinity, ii. Quâ Man, He is made under the Law; quâ God, He is Lord of the sabbath.

Origen, Matthew (Cramer). He reasoned with them from this example that they might have no excuse for obstinacy (shamelessness) so as to accuse Him again because of the cure; then He said to the man. . . (v. 13). But they, though not wronged, go forth and take counsel to slay Him; so great an evil is envy.<sup>1</sup> But He, gentle and meek, withdrew on learning this. But many multitudes followed Him; Why? marvelling at Him. But *they* did not turn from their evil purpose.

Origen, Matthew (Gallandi). ('They went out'.) In so far as any is near to Jesus, He does not take counsel; for the counsel of the wicked is not near Jesus. When any

<sup>1</sup> *βασκανία*.

one goes forth from Jesus, he takes counsel to destroy the Light, the Good way, the Life, the Treasure, who bore witness of love and peace. If any destroy this, he is called the son of perdition.<sup>1</sup> He withdrew, for it was not meet for him to remain with the sons of perdition. They lost (destroyed) ; we who had not sought, found. . . Isa. lxxv. 1. He came to the lost sheep ; *they* forgot their own shepherd. He withdraws, not fearing their plot, but restraining their wickedness, and that none might think that He had withdrawn from fear, He healed all, showing His almighty power. But He withdraws from being made public, being modest and free from vain-glory.

#### B. MATT. xii. 15-21

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iii. 17. According to Isaiah's prophecy, Christ neither strove nor cried aloud, nor was His voice heard in the street ; He crushed not the bruised reed, i.e. the shattered faith of the Jews ; He did not quench the smoking flax, i.e. the quickly kindled eagerness of the Gentiles. (Cp. Jews, 9.)

**Origen**, Cramer's Catena. A bruised reed is a heart bruised in sins, smoking (swelling)<sup>2</sup> flax, those who are lifted up against the truth.

**Origen**, Cramer's Catena. By the reed<sup>3</sup> He means him who at the command of Pilate wrote in mockery. ' This is the King of the Jews ; ' whom though He might easily have broken by blindness, He did not crush, but endured to suffer, and bear the inscription. ' Swelling ' <sup>4</sup> flax is the conceit<sup>5</sup> of the kings who set themselves against

<sup>1</sup> Destruction. ὀπωλεία.

<sup>2</sup> Pen. κάλαμος.

<sup>3</sup> τυφόμενον.

<sup>4</sup> τυφόμενος.

<sup>5</sup> τῦφος.



Him—that of Pilate and Herod, puffed up by their rule and pomp, and daring to judge the Judge of Judges; which also the Lord Jesus did not now quench, working out the salvation of men by His own suffering.

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, ix. 15, p. 452. Comment on Isa. xlii. 1–7. The evangelist mentions the passage (Eusebius gives the occasion). All *this* has come to pass, viz. His retirement and avoidance of those plotting against Him, His anxiety to escape notice in the wonders which He wrought, and His charging those who were healed not to make Him known. Matthew, unlike Isaiah, omits the names ‘Jacob’ and ‘Israel.’ These names, not being in the Hebrew, are obelized in the LXX and omitted by the other interpreters; hence they are naturally not in the evangelist who was a Hebrew and set forth the prophecy according to the Scripture of the Hebrews.

#### A. XL

MATT. x. 2–4; MARK iii. 13–19; LUKE vi. 12–16

Irenæus, I, i. 5, H.; I. iii. 1, p. 14, M. The Valentinians say that the emanation of the Dodecad of the aeons was shown . . . through the choice of the Apostles, for there are twelve Apostles.

Clement, Strom. VI, xiii. 105, 1. The Apostles did not when chosen<sup>1</sup> become Apostles by reason of any special property<sup>2</sup> of their nature, since Judas also was chosen with them; but were able to become Apostles, having been chosen by Him who foresees the issues.

Tertullian, Prescription of Heretics, xxii. Who of sound mind can believe that anything was unknown to the Apostles whom the Lord gave to be teachers, having

<sup>1</sup> ἐκλεκτοί.

<sup>2</sup> ἰδίωμα.

them inseparable<sup>1</sup> in companionship, in discipleship, in intercourse,<sup>2</sup> to whom He explained privately all obscurities, saying that to them it was given to know secrets which the people were not allowed to understand?

Against Marcion, iv. 13. He ascends the mountain, continues all night in prayer, and is certainly heard by the Father; fulfilling such prophecies as Isa. xl. 9; lli. 6-7; Nahum i. 15; Ps. xxii. 2; iii. 4.

Why did He choose twelve Apostles, and not any other number? . . . I find types of this number with the Creator; twelve springs at Elim, because as springs and streams the Apostles were to water the world of the Gentiles, formerly dry and desolate of the knowledge of God; twelve gems, in Aaron's priestly robe, because they were like gems to illuminate the holy garment of the Church worn by Christ the High Priest of the Father; twelve stones chosen by Joshua out of Jordan and laid up in the ark of the covenant, because they were as stones solid with faith, which the true Joshua (Jesus) chose from the washing (laver) of Jordan and received into the sanctuary of His covenant.

Origen, Matthew (Possinus). Twelve disciples, according to the number of the twelve legions of angels, or the twelve hours of the day. Six is a perfect number, the disciples double this.

Cyprian, Lord's Prayer, xxix. (The Lord taught us to pray, by His own example.) But if He who was without sin used to pray, how much more ought sinners to pray, and if He watching constantly throughout the whole night prayed with incessant prayers, how much more ought we to watch by night in constant prayer? But the

<sup>1</sup> Individuos.

<sup>2</sup> Convictu.

Lord prayed and entreated not for Himself—for what prayer should One who is innocent offer for Himself?—but for our transgressions.

Epistles xi. 5. He gives an example of constant and watchful prayer. What He prayed He certainly prayed for us, since He was not a sinner, but was bearing our sins.

Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 13. He changes Simon's name to Peter, just as the Creator re-shaped the names of Abraham and Sarah and Hoshea (Auses)—calling him Joshua. . . But why 'Peter'? If because of the vigour of his faith, many materials <sup>1</sup> equally solid, might lend a name from themselves. Or is it because Christ is both a rock and a stone 'set for a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence'? So He chose to impart to His dearest disciple a name specially belonging to figures of Himself, rather than from what were not His own.

Origen, Matthew, Book XII. 32, p. 552. 'Sons of thunder'—begotten of the mighty voice of God who thunders and cries aloud great things from heaven, to those who have ears and are wise.

Apocalypse, Schol. XXXVI. (T. U. XXXVIII). Inquiring about the 'sons of thunder', James and John, whom 'Jesus called Boanerges, that is, sons of thunder,' you will find them naturally called sons of thunder because of the majesty <sup>2</sup> of their thoughts and doctrines.

Eusebius, Psalm lxxvi (vii) 18. Thunder : the Gospel preaching. For as the voice of thunder is a heavenly cry, surpassing all human power, so the Gospel message is heavenly, and carries superhuman strength. Nor did it issue from mortal will ; but with divine power it filled

<sup>1</sup> *Materiae.*

<sup>2</sup> *μεγαλοφωνίαν.*

the whole world. Wherefore also the Saviour named His Apostles Boanerges, sons of thunder.

Gospel Demonstration, iii. 5, p. 120. Matthew calls himself a publican, not concealing his former life, and puts himself after his colleague Thomas. The other evangelists do not call him 'the publican,' and put him before Thomas.

(Eusebius adduces this as showing Matthew's modesty and love of truth.)

Origen, Matthew, 78 (Latin), p. 894. There are two disciples of Christ named 'Judas', according to Luke's list of Apostles; Judas of James and Judas Iscariot. (See on Matt. xxvi. 14, § cxliii). . . .

Romans, Preface. (Among cases of persons having two or three names.) Matthew speaks of his own call, by his own name; Luke speaks of him as 'Levi'; Matthew in his list of the apostles speaks of Matthew the publican, and James of Alphaeus and Lebbaeus, and Simon Chananaeus; but Mark of 'Matthew the publican and Thomas, and James of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus.' So whom Matthew calls Lebbaeus, Mark calls Thaddaeus; while Luke has set down Matthew, Thomas, James and Judas of James; and the same man whom Matthew called Lebbaeus and Mark Thaddaeus; Luke described as 'Judas of James.' But it is certain that the evangelists made no mistake in the names of the apostles; but as it was customary for Hebrews to have two or three names each, they each put down a different name of one and the same man.

*B. MATT. iv. 24-25; MARK iii. 7-12;  
LUKE vi. 17-19*

Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 13. They come together from Tyre and from other districts, a multitude



also from beyond the sea. This fulfils Ps. lxxxvii. 4-5; Isa. xlix. 12, 18, 21.

Matt. iv. 24. Origen, on Ps. cxi (cxii) 7, p. 788. ἀκοή 'hearing,' here means 'report';<sup>1</sup> so in Matt. xxiv. 6.

## XLI

### MATT. v. 1-vii. 29; WITH PARALLELS IN LUKE

The comments on the Sermon on the Mount are extremely numerous.

Origen, Matthew, S. 9 (Latin) p. 835, notices that the Beatitudes are addressed to *disciples* alone, not to the multitudes also as Matt. v. 1-3, and Luke vi. 20, both show.

Luke, Hom. xxxviii, p. 977. All the Beatitudes which Jesus uttered in the Gospel, He confirms by His example, exemplifying what He taught. So He says 'Blessed are the meek', and again of Himself 'Learn of Me, for I am meek'. He says 'Blessed are the peacemakers'—who is such a peacemaker as my Lord Jesus, who is our peace; who did away with the enmity and destroyed it in His flesh? 'Blessed are they who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake'; no one so endured persecution for righteousness' sake as the Lord Jesus, Who was crucified for our sins. So the Lord displayed all the Beatitudes in Himself. Thus having said 'Blessed are they that weep', He Himself wept over Jerusalem, to lay the foundation of this Beatitude also.

Celsus vi. 16, p. 642. Celsus ought to have examined the fact that the poor are counted blessed by Jesus, but the rich counted wretched; whether this applies to the literal poor and rich or whether the Word knows some

<sup>1</sup> φήμη.

poverty altogether counted blessed and some riches altogether blameable ; for not even any casual speaker would have praised the poor indiscriminately, many of them being of very worthless character.

John, Tome xiii. 42, p. 252 (on John iv. 35, ' Lift up your eyes ' ). The Saviour when about to speak the Beatitudes to those assembled in the plain, lifts up His eyes upon His disciples and says ' Blessed are these and those ' ; for no genuine disciple of Jesus is below.

So xxviii. 4, p. 372 (on John xi. 41).

Clement, Strom. IV. vi. 25ff, p. 575. Our holy Saviour applied poverty and wealth and the like to the case of both spiritual and sensible things. Saying ' Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake ' ; He teaches us in every circumstance <sup>1</sup> to seek for the witness, who if he be poor for righteousness' sake, witnesses to the goodness of righteousness which he loved ; if he hunger and thirst for righteousness' sake he bears witness that righteousness is actually the best of things ; so also he who weeps and mourns for righteousness' sake, bears witness to the goodness of the best of laws. As He calls blessed those who have been persecuted, so also those hungering and thirsting for righteousness' sake ; He welcomes the genuine longing which not even hunger is able to set aside. And if they hunger for righteousness itself, they are blessed ; and ' blessed are the poor ', whether in spirit or in wealth, <sup>2</sup> that is for righteousness' sake—not merely the needy, but those who have willed to become poor for righteousness' sake He has called blessed—those who have scorned honours here in order to win what is good. . . .

<sup>1</sup> περιστάσει.

<sup>2</sup> περιουσία.

**Tertullian**, 11. Great is the reward of this duty (Patience), even happiness.<sup>1</sup> For whom but the patient did the Lord name 'Happy'<sup>2</sup> by saying 'Blessed (Happy) are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven'? Assuredly none is poor in spirit except the humble; but who is humble except the patient? because no one can subject himself without starting with the patience involved in the very act of subjection. 'Blessed are the weeping and mourning;' who endures such things without patience? Therefore to such is promised both comforting (*advocatio*) and laughter. 'Blessed are the meek.' The impatient certainly cannot be included by this term. So again when He marks the peacemakers with the same title of happiness, and calls them 'sons of God'; have the impatient any connection with peace? One would be foolish to think it! And when He says 'Rejoice and exult, as often as they curse and persecute you, for your reward is very great in heaven'; this is certainly not promised to impatience, for no one will rejoice in troubles, unless he has previously despised them; and no one will despise them, unless he has practised patience.

**Origen**, First Principles, II. iii. 7, p. 84. Those who have obeyed the word of God and thus shown themselves possessed<sup>3</sup> of His wisdom are said to deserve the kingdom of (the highest) heaven or heavens. So more worthily is the saying fulfilled—'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth;' and 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for they shall inherit the kingdom of heaven;' also Ps. xxxvii. 34. A way appears so as to speak opened for the progress of the saints from that earth to these heavens; that they may seem not so much

<sup>1</sup> Felicitas.<sup>2</sup> Felices.<sup>3</sup> Capaces.

to settle in that earth as to sojourn there ; being about to pass, when they have made progress for it, to the kingdom of heaven.

Leviticus, Hom. xvi. 3, p. 259. The provisions of the future are of many kinds. To the poor in spirit is promised the kingdom of heaven ; *this* is not the promise to the meek, but the inheritance of the earth ; nor to the peacemakers, whom He pronounces to be sons of God. He promises different things to different men, calling all ' Blessed ' who shall come to what is promised ; but He has not promised to all the Kingdom of Heaven. This is the highest of all blessings ; but the Lord said, ' In My Father's house are many mansions.'

Matthew, Book XVI. 16, p. 740. The first blessing is the Kingdom of Heaven ; the second, ' they shall inherit the earth,' but not so as to live there for ever ; for having been comforted and filled with righteousness because of having hungered and thirsted after it, and having obtained mercy, seen God and been called His sons, they are restored to the Kingdom of Heaven.

Joshua, Hom. v. 1, p. 407. ' We must first fulfil what is written " Blessed are the poor in spirit, " that laying aside all pride and taking up the humility of Christ, we may reach the promised blessing. But having done this we must not stand still, but pass on to the rest, hungering and thirsting for righteousness, mourning in this world, becoming meek, continuing peaceable. . . .

Hippolytus, Psalms (Achelis, p. 129). The First Psalm consists of nine Beatitudes, like the nine in Matthew ; it follows the same rule, viz. of action and suffering.

Methodius, Symposium vii. 3. The Lord does not agree to give the same honours to all, but reckons some in the Kingdom of Heaven, promises to others the inheritance of the earth, to others that they shall see the Father.



**Clementine Recognitions, II. 28–29.** In the beginning of His preaching, since He wished to invite all and bring them to salvation and to encourage them to endure toils and temptations, He called the poor blessed, and promised that they in return for enduring want, should attain the Kingdom of Heaven ; in order that under this great hope they might cheerfully bear the burden of poverty, despising desire, which is the greatest of fatal sins. He further promised that the hungry and thirsty should be filled with eternal blessings of righteousness, in order that patiently enduring need, they might on this account take in hand nothing unrighteous. So also He called the pure in heart blessed, and said that through this they would see God ; in order that each desiring to obtain so great a blessing, might restrain himself from evil and polluted thoughts. . . . He bids those who believe and obey to have peace among themselves, and says to them, ‘ Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God. ’

v. 3. **Clement, Rich Man, xvi.** (See Introduction, 12).

XVII. . . (There are two sorts of treasures, and two of wealth ; so also two kinds of poverty.) The poverty which is pronounced blessed is the spiritual. Therefore to ‘ Blessed are the poor ’ Matthew adds ‘ in spirit ’ ; and again ‘ Blessed are they that hunger and thirst for the righteousness of God ’. Therefore the poor of the opposite kind are wretched, with no portion in God, and still less in human possessions, and without taste of the righteousness of God.

XIX. There is a genuine poor man, and a spurious and falsely called poor man. The poor as regards the spirit is such in the proper sense, the poor as regards the world is such in the improper sense. To him then who is poor as regards the world but rich as regards his

passions, he who is poor as regards his spirit and rich as regards God says, 'Depart from your alien possessions which are in your soul, that becoming pure in heart you may see God,' which in other words is to enter the kingdom of heaven.

**Tertullian**, *Flight in Persecutions*, 12. (Against escape by paying blackmail.) A Christian is preserved by wealth, and has money for this object, that he may not suffer while he will be rich against God! But Christ was rich in blood for him; therefore, 'Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven' who have their soul alone treasured up.<sup>1</sup>

**Origen**, *Matthew*, Book XIV. 7, p. 623. Christ is theirs inasmuch as He is the Kingdom itself, reigning over every thought of him over whom sin no longer reigns; reigning in so far as righteousness and wisdom and truth and the other virtues are his who has become heaven by wearing the image of the heavenly.

**Manes** (Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxvi. lxxx, p. 701), declared that 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven' is opposed to the Old Testament, 'The silver is mine and the gold is mine,' Haggai, ii. 8.

'So in *Hegemonius* [Acts of Archelaus, xlv (xl) 8,] God says, "I make rich and poor"; Jesus calls the poor blessed.' Archelaus in answer says [xlvii (xlii) 3], Jesus did not say the poor in worldly substance, but the poor in spirit; that is those who are not inflamed by pride, but who soften and bow themselves with humility, not thinking more highly than they ought to think.

**Clementine Homilies**, xv. 10. Peter is asked, 'Do we not see many ungodly poor? are they of the number of the

<sup>1</sup> In confiscato.

saved on this account?' He replies, 'Certainly not. Poverty is not acceptable if it longs for what is not befitting. . . . Those who long after gain are punished. Our Master promised blessing on the faithful poor, not for having bestowed anything, for they have nothing to bestow, but as having in no wise sinned and not to be condemned simply for not giving alms, because they have nothing.'

Methodius, Free-will (Bonwetsch, p. 68), God . . . when among us was among the poor. He did not honour the rich, but imitated the poor. He counted them blessed, promising them riches, an imperishable, true and indestructible kingdom; but to those who are rich in this present time He said that they obtain their reward; for in place of the eternal they have gained this temporal welfare.

Eusebius, Demonstration of Gospel, iii. 1, p. 88. Isaiah prophesied in the person of Christ, 'He hath sent me to preach the Gospel to the poor.' The Lord claimed to fulfil this, Luke iv. 18. So he placed them first in His Beatitudes, saying 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.'

Psalms xli (x1) 1. 'Poor'=those living as philosophers according to God; poor with divine training.<sup>1</sup> They were His disciples and apostles.

Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 14, on Luke vi. 20. 'Blessed are the beggars' ('mendici'), for this is the meaning of the Greek. It is the part of the Creator to begin with blessings; and He continually comforts, maintains and vindicates the beggars, the poor, and the lowly. (Passages from Psalms are quoted.) If you think the Creator's promises to be earthly, but Christ's

<sup>1</sup> ἄσκησις.

heavenly, it is well that the heaven is so far seen to belong to no other God than that of the earth. The Creator promised lesser things that I may believe Him more readily in greater things than Him who has never displayed proof of liberality in lesser.

Wife, ii. 8. (A Christian widow should marry a poor Christian, rather than a rich heathen.) If it is the poor, not the rich, whose is the kingdom of heaven, one who is rich will find more in one who is poor. She will be dowered with an ample dowry from the goods of him who is rich in God.

v. 4. Clement, Strom. IV. vi. 37, 5. 'Those who have repented of the evil of their past life will come to the calling' <sup>1</sup> for this is the meaning of *παρακληθῆναι*.

Cyprian, Epistle lv. 23. 'Because he who mourns calls forth mercy.'

Lake vi. 21. Tertullian (Against Marcion iv. 14), compares Isa. lxxv. 13, and Ps. cxxv (vi) 5.

Origen, Ps. xxxvii (xxxviii) 7. (Pitra, Analecta, iii. 21.) If you have considered him who mourns and weeps over his sins, you have seen him blessed.<sup>2</sup> But if you, on the other hand, have beheld him laughing and cheerful, and not feeling compunction over his own sins, see if *this* does not suit him, 'Woe, ye who laugh now.'

Jeremiah, Hom. xx. 6, p. 269. Laughter is here a promise, opposite to which promise is the weeping here called blessed. You may ask whether the weeping that is blessed harmonises according to another meaning with the good laughter, while another weeping, declared woeful<sup>3</sup> and laid up for the adversaries, is opposed to it. . . . The weeping that is called blessed differs from

<sup>1</sup> εἰς τὴν κλήσιν παρέσονται.

<sup>2</sup> μακαριστός.

<sup>3</sup> ταλανιζόμενος.



that laid up for evil livers. But if this also has some profitable end, I know not. (The laughter promised follows sorrow for sin.)

John, Book XX. 4, p. 312. Origen interprets Ps. cxxv (vi) 5, of the journey with weeping of some souls coming to birth bearing the seeds either of a majority of righteous ancestors, or of fewer mingled with unrighteous. Those now weeping may rejoice hereafter, while others now rejoicing may weep. According to this view, the Saviour's words, Luke vi. 21-25, may have a deeper and more mysterious meaning.

v. 5. Irenæus, V. lx. 4 (3), p. 303. (Discussing 'flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God.') If one must say the truth, the flesh does not inherit but is inherited; as also the Lord said 'Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth,' as if in the kingdom the earth were inherited, from which also is the substance of our flesh.

Clement, Strom. IV. vi. 36, 1. The meek are those who have brought to an end the implacable warfare in the soul of passion and appetite and like forces. He praises those who are meek by choice, not by necessity.

Origen, Hom. ii. 6, on Ps. xxxvi (xxxvii), p. 662 on Ps. xxxvii. 11. (Greek in fragment preserved by Gallandi.) This verse is to be adduced against the Valentinians and others, who think that our Saviour says in the Gospel things not in the older writings. He repeats what was said more fully by the Holy Spirit through David.

Against Celsus, v. 63, p. 627. Those who have understood 'Blessed are the peacemakers' and also 'Blessed are the meek' will not hate those who counterfeit Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> τὰ χριστιανισμοῦ.

Matthew (Possinus' Catena). They define meekness<sup>1</sup> as a kind of peaceableness<sup>2</sup> towards those who sin, or a habit<sup>3</sup> by which we are gently disposed towards the punishment of those who sin; or control of anger, or undisturbed easiness<sup>4</sup> of soul.

'The earth' (land) is interpreted by Origen (First Principles II. iii. 6, p. 83) as the earth comprehended within the highest heaven of all, above our sphere; this is indeed 'the good land' or 'the land of the living.' In Jeremiah, Hom. ix. 3, p. 180, he says this land is meant in the Old Testament promise of the 'land flowing with milk and honey.'

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration iii. 2, p. 91. Christ says this, promising to those who lead rightly the life marked out by Him, a much better land, of a truth both holy and dear to God; not that in Judæa, which in no way surpassed the rest, but that which in heaven befits souls who love God. He means the same when promising 'the kingdom of heaven' to those whom He calls 'Blessed.'

Cp. Ps. xlvii (vii) 1.

v. 6. Clement, Prophetic Selections, xiv. 4. The soul, not the body, experiences this craving.

Origen, First Principles, II. xi. 2, p. 104. The Saviour also blesses those who now hunger and thirst, promising them that they shall be filled. Some take this literally, as they do Old Testament promises (Isa. lx and lxxv) and Matt. xxvi. 29, not seeing that their meaning is to be understood figuratively.

John, Tome xiii. 4, p. 215. Perhaps, since the hunger and thirst after righteousness will be necessary before

<sup>1</sup> πραότης.

<sup>2</sup> ἡσυχία.

<sup>3</sup> ἔξις.

<sup>4</sup> εὐκολία.

being filled, the hungering and thirsting must be produced for the sake of the satisfaction, that we may say Ps. xlii. 1f. (In the water given by Jesus which becomes in him who drinks it a spring of water springing up to eternal life, the promise of the Beatitude is fulfilled.)

**Tertullian**, *Against Marcion*, iv. 14 (on Luke vi. 21). I might have referred this to the former blessing ; for the hungry are none other than the poor and beggars ; if the Creator had not expressly marked out this promise in Isa. v. 26f. (LXX) lxv. 13. These beatitudes agree with the message of Isa. lxi. 1f.

**Cyprian**, *Epistle lxiii.* 8. Let it trouble none that when divine Scripture speaks of Baptism it says that we thirst and drink (John vii. 37f). When also the Lord in His Gospel says, 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness ;' because that which is received with keen and thirsty desire is drained more fully and plentifully.

v. 7. **Clement**, *Strom.* IV. vi. 38, 1. Mercy (Pity<sup>1</sup>) is not as some philosophers have supposed 'Grief at another's misfortunes' but something nobler, as the prophets say 'I will mercy and not sacrifice.' He means by the merciful not only those who do mercy but also those whose wish is to have mercy, though unable to do it. The activity is present as regards the will. (We often desire to help another, but are not able.)

**Origen**, *Possinus' Catena*. Mercy and truth go before the true God.

v. 8. **Clement**, *Strom.* IV. vi. 39, 1. Since there are two ways for those who go to the perfection of salvation, viz. works and knowledge, He said 'Blessed are the

<sup>1</sup> ἔλεος.

pure in heart, for they shall see God'. . . . He wants those who attain to the knowledge of God to be pure as regards bodily desires and holy as regards thoughts; that the ruling faculty (the reason<sup>1</sup>) may have nothing spurious in the way of its efficacy.

V. i. 7, 7. We find in Moses 'No one shall see my face and live.' It is clear that none can ever during his lifetime clearly comprehend God; the pure in heart will see God when they have come to their final perfection.

Origen, First Principles, I. i. 9, p. 53. To see God with the heart is to understand and know Him with the mind. The names of bodily<sup>2</sup> members are often applied to the soul, so as to speak of seeing with the eyes of the heart, i.e. arriving at something intellectual by virtue of understanding. . . . (So of hearing, etc.). . . . Therefore by the divine sense not of the eyes but of the pure heart, which is the mind, God can be seen by those who are worthy. You will find abundantly in all the New and Old Scriptures 'heart' used for 'mind,' i.e. powers of intellect.

Against Celsus, VI. iv. p. 632. (Philocalia xv. 6.) God was seen by, e.g. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, not with the bodily eyes, but with the pure heart.

lxix. p. 685. God is invisible, because not a body; but He can be contemplated by the contemplative<sup>3</sup> by the heart, i.e. by the mind; not by *any* heart, but by a pure heart. For it is not right for a defiled heart to gaze upon God, but that which can worthily contemplate the pure must itself be pure.

VII. xxxiii. p. 717.

<sup>1</sup> τὸ ἡγεμονικόν.

<sup>2</sup> Sensibilium, sensible.

<sup>3</sup> τοῖς θεωρητικοῖς.



Ps. lxxviii (ix) 28, p. 758. To see God is to be counted worthy of the knowledge of Him.

Isaiah, Hom. vi. 5, p. 118. 'Heart' in Isa. vi. 10, as in Matt. v. 8, means the ruling faculty <sup>1</sup> of our soul. Those of pure heart are not those who have no blood as corporeal matter within; but the meaning is 'Blessed are those who have the ruling faculty of their soul pure. It is impure when evil thoughts . . . proceed from it; but pure when its thoughts are holy, perceptions divine, and mind clear.

Matthew (in Possinus' Catena). No one impure and defiled by passions will ever see God. The eye of our soul is shrouded by the disturbances of life, but through active virtue arises and sees the light and through it God.

John, Tome xix. 22, p. 305. There is a spiritual invisible world, whose aspect and beauty the pure in heart will see. Through seeing it they are prepared to seek after it, so as to see God Himself, as is His nature to be seen.

Fragment 13. He is not simply visible even to the mind, but to him (or 'to that mind') which is clear from all ignorance and evil and matter. For 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God'. By 'heart' He means 'mind'. He who has become . . . pure, being perfected in virtue, approaches God as far as it is possible.

Romans, Book IV, 8, p. 536. When pain and sorrow and groaning shall have fled away and all the things now seen in mirror and enigma shall be done away, and those which are face to face will remain.

Novatian, On the Trinity, 28. (Against the Patripassians.) He here promises the contemplation and sight of the

<sup>1</sup> Principale = τὸ ἡγεμονικόν.

**Father.** Therefore He had not yet bestowed it; for why should He promise it if He had already bestowed it? For if He were the Father, He had bestowed it, for He was being seen and touched<sup>1</sup>. . . . But because He is Son and not Father, fitly the Son, because the Image of God, was being seen, while the Father, because invisible, was promised to be seen by the pure in heart.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies, iii. 70. Heading 'The innocent asks confidently and obtains.'

**Methodius**, Symposium, xi. 3. Since they bring in nothing that darkens or troubles the eye of the soul for divine contemplation; but being altogether free from worldly lusts, they keep not only the flesh pure, but the heart always unreceptive of every thought of incontinence, in which heart as in a shrine the Holy Spirit especially dwells and rests.

**Clementine Recognitions**, iii. 30. He shows that the time will come when instead of men they will become angels, who will see God in the spirit of the mind.

**Eusebius**, Prophetic Selections, i. 12. Our Lord and Saviour teaches that to see God is the privilege of those who are perfect and have their mind completely cleansed.

**Ps. cxxxix (cxl) 14.** What is better than with purified mind to see God face to face?

**v. 9, Clement**, Strom. IV. vi. 40, 2. Blessed are the peacemakers, who have tamed and subdued the law that wars against the disposition<sup>2</sup> of our mind, the threats of passion, the baits of desire and the other appetites which make war on the reason; having lived with knowledge of good works and true reason, they shall be

<sup>1</sup> Contingebatur.

<sup>2</sup> φρονήματι.

restored to the most lovely adoption.<sup>1</sup> The perfect peacemaking would be that which keeps peaceableness unchanged under all circumstances whatever, calling God's administration holy and good; based on knowledge of divine and human affairs, through which knowledge it reckons the oppositions in the world to be the fairest harmony of creation. They bring also to peace who teach those who are here assailed by the stratagems of sin to return to faith and peace.

I. i. 7, 2. Blessed are the peacemakers who teach again those assailed here by ignorance through this life and deceit, and bring them back to peace in word and life that is according to God, and who feed with distribution of bread those who hunger for righteousness.

Origen, Matthew, Tome ii. Philocalia, vi. To him who is in both ways a peacemaker nothing in the divine oracles is any longer crooked or tangled, for all things lie open to those who understand . . . therefore he sees abundance of peace in all the Scriptures, even in those which appear to contain conflict and mutual contradictions. And there is yet a third peacemaker, he who shows that what appears to others a conflict of the Scriptures is really no conflict, and who establishes their harmony and peace, either of Old with New or legal with prophetic, or Gospel with Gospel, or Gospel with apostolic or apostolic with apostolic.

(The above is perhaps summarised in Possinus' Catena.) 'Those who rightly interpret apparent conflict among the Holy Scriptures and bring them to agreement, and teach others to be so minded, are called peacemakers.'

<sup>1</sup> εἰς υἰοθεσίαν ἀποκαταστήσονται τὴν προσφιλεσ-  
τάτην.

**Cyprian**, Unity of the Church, xxiv. If we are sons of God, we ought to be pacific, meek in heart, simple in speech, harmonious in affection, faithfully clinging one to another in bonds of unanimity.

*vv.* 10-11. Luke vi. 22-3. **Clement**, Strom. IV. vi. 41, 2. The Lord here teaches us the sum of all virtue, that we ought because of love towards God to despise death. . .

Some who make changes in the Gospels have 'Blessed are they who have been persecuted for righteousness' sake, for they shall be perfect; and blessed are they who have been persecuted for My sake, for they shall have a place where they shall not be persecuted.'

*v.* 11. Luke vi. 23. Namely, if we do not loathe our persecutors, but endure our punishment at their hands, not hating them, but considering that we have been put to trial more tardily than we expected, but knowing that trial of all kinds is an occasion for testimony.

**Origen**, Possinus' Catena. All who have chosen to live in Christ, or even in any other way follow virtue, will be persecuted, because of the diversity of habit, and the inclination of their persecutors to evil.

**Origen**, Jeremiah, Hom. i. 13. Let them who are being persecuted pray that they may be persecuted unjustly and not justly; not because of injustice or sin or greed. But if any is persecuted for righteousness' sake, let him hear our Lord's words.

**Matthew**, Tome x. 18, p. 466. If any one attending carefully to these things is, because of living strenuously and rebuking sinners, hated and plotted against as one persecuted and reproached for righteousness' sake, he will not only not be grieved but will even rejoice and exult, persuaded that because of these things he has a great reward in heaven from Him who likened him to the prophets for having suffered these things.



**Tertullian**, *Flight in Persecution*, vii. Unhappy then are they who will by flight have escaped suffering according to the commandment.

Scorpiace, IX. v. 10 is spoken to all, without restriction, vv. 11-12 specially to the apostles, so as to prophesy that they would be killed according to the precedent of the prophets. . . . Yet the teaching to endure persecution concerns us also as disciples by inheritance, and shoots (frutices) from apostolic seed.

Against Marcion, iv. 14. He exhorts to patience ; so does the Creator, through Isa. li. 7.

He was overthrowing the prophets as a rival, turning their disciples to Himself ; but maintaining them as a friend, attacking their persecutors.

**Cyprian**, *Fortunatus*, 12. The Lord is the avenger of our persecution and the rewarder of our suffering.

*Lapsed*, xii. Regarding the rewards which the Lord sets before us and knowing the truth of God who promises them, we should not fear the loss of our property, but should even desire it, since the Lord declares and exhorts, Luke vi. 22-3.

Luke vi. 24-6. **Tertullian**, *Against Marcion*, iv. 15. The 'woes' are not in keeping with Marcion's God. But the question arises whether the 'woe' is one of malediction or rather one of admonition. But this makes little difference, since admonition is not without a prick of commination, especially when made more bitter by the 'woe'. . . . Some hold that the 'woe' is not Christ's but the Creator's ; He seems to contrast it with His own blessing ; as if it were not competent for the Creator, because He had previously set forth His goodness by blessings, to add also severity by cursings, thus affording full breadth of instruction on both hands, to follow after blessing and avoid cursing. . . . Thus if the

woe to the rich is not Christ's, but the Creator's, then it is the Creator who is wroth with the rich ; not Christ, who sanctions the cause of riches ; pride, glory, pursuit of the world, carelessness of God !

But how is it inconsistent to reprove the rich and approve the poor ? Both pertain to the Creator. He made Solomon rich, but it was because he had chosen things better than riches.

Although it is not incongruous for God to bestow riches, through which both the rich receive the consolation, i.e. that which comes from riches as regards their glory and worldly profits ; and from which many works of righteousness are furnished. The faults connected with riches are ascribed in the ' woe ' to the rich—as in Old Testament, Deut. viii. 12f ; Jer. ix. 23 ; Isa. iii. 16f ; v. 14. ' The rich . . . shall descend into it.' This will be Christ's ' woe ' upon the rich ; so Isa. x. 33-4. Who more than the rich ? Because they received their comfort (*advocationem*), glory and weight of honours from their riches. The word ' woe ' is found in Amos vi. 4-6. The subsequent woes are foreshadowed by Isa. lxv. 13 ; Ps. cxxvi. 5. In the Gospel those who sow in laughter, viz. from joy, shall reap in tears. With the last sentence (*v.* 26) cp. Isa. iii. 12. The Creator assails those who pursue blessing and human praise. So, Jer. xvii. 5 ; Ps. cxviii. 8-9.

**Novatian**, *Jewish Meats*, vi. No one has restrained gluttony so much as Christ, who declared the needy to be blessed, the hungry and thirsty to be happy ; but wretched to be the rich to whom being slaves at the command of the belly and gullet (*gulæ*) material for pleasure would never fail, lest the slavery should possibly cease ; who think it a proof of happiness to covet as much as they can, except that even so they can have less than they covet.

**Origen**, Ps. xxxvii (viii), Hom. i. 5, p. 689. 'Blessed are they who mourn and weep' refers to sorrow for sin. On the other hand, if any is a sinner and feels no compunction for his sins, but moreover laughs and is joyful and merry, and is smitten in no wise by pricks of conscience, is it not fitting that *v.* 25 should be said to him?

Matt. v. 13-14. **Irenæus**, I. ii. H.; I. vi. 1, p. 28, M. The Valentinians call the Spiritual, sent forth to join itself to the Psychical, the salt and the light of the world.

*v.* 13. **Clement**, Strom I. viii. 41, 3. 'Ye are the salt of the earth' was not said to all. Some even among those who have listened to the Word are like the fish of the sea, who though brought up in brine from their birth, yet need to be prepared with salt.

**Origen**, Celsus viii. 70, p. 794. The men of God are the salt which preserves the earthly constitution of the world; the things on earth consist together so far as the salt does not change; but if the salt has lost its savour, it has no strength either for earth or for dung, but is cast out and trodden under foot by men.

(See also John, Tome vi. 59 (38), below, on *v.* 14.)

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer xvii. The disciples are called by Him not 'earth' but the 'salt of the earth'. (We ought to pray for those who are still earthy and have not yet begun to be heavenly.)

Testimonies iii. 87. Quoted under heading 'The faithful ought to combine simplicity and prudence.'

So, Unity of Catholic Church, 1.

**Lucius of Castra Galbae** (Judgments of the Bishops, 7). Schismatics cannot season with spiritual wisdom, since by departing from the one Church they have become savourless ('infatuati').

Dice-Players, 2. We (Bishops) are therefore called the salt of the earth, that from us the whole brotherhood

may be seasoned with heavenly wisdom. For when He saith, 'But if the salt . . . by men', we dread and fear lest while at ease<sup>1</sup> in the church because the sacerdotal dignity has been bestowed on us by the Lord, we be found careless.

v. 14f. Irenæus, IV. xiii. H.; IV. vii. 3, p. 235, M. Irenæus referring to Gen. xv. 5, says 'God through Christ prepares luminaries in the world, i.e. those who believe from the Gentiles. He says 'Ye are the light of the world,' that is as the stars of heaven.

Clement, Excerpts from Theodotus, 41, gives a Gnostic interpretation.

Origen, Celsus, VII. li. p. 731. If we do things worthy of Him who said to the disciples 'Ye are the light of the world' and of the Word who taught that 'the light shineth in the darkness', we shall both be a light to those in darkness and shall instruct the foolish and teach the babes.

Judges, Hom. i. 2, p. 460. If the Apostles also (besides the Lord) are the light of the world, they without doubt illumine for us, by their precepts and commandments, days in which we may serve the Lord.

Ezekiel, Hom. ix. 3, p. 390. As the light of a lamp is obscured in the rays of the sun . . . so the light of all the righteous may shine before men, yet it shines not before Christ. . . . Their light compared with His light is found to be darkness, so it is not said simply 'Let your light shine' but 'let it shine before men'. As the brilliancy of the moon and the twinkling stars of the heaven gleam in their stations before the sun rises, but are hidden when the sun has risen; so the light of the Church like the light of the moon gleams forth and is bright before

<sup>1</sup> Securi.



men, before the true light of the 'Sun of Righteousness' rises; but when Christ shall have come, it will grow dark before Him.

Matthew (Possinus' Catena.) 'Before men'; not before God, for God knows your works; but before men, that God may be glorified by them.

Matthew, Book X. 3, p. 445. Perhaps 'Let your light shine before men' may be in Solomon's words (Prov. xxii. 20, LXX) written out on the breadth of the heart in a threefold way: (1) Now the light of the disciples of Jesus shines before the rest of men. (2) It will shine after their departure, before the resurrection. (3) And after the resurrection, till all attain to a perfect man and all become one sun.

John, Tome i. 25 (24), p. 27. When He says this to His disciples, we suppose that the analogy of the moon and stars holds good of the bride-church and the disciples—having light either of their own or acquired from the true Sun, that they may enlighten those who have not been able to provide a source of light in themselves; just as we shall call Paul and Peter the light of the world, but any chance disciples of theirs who are being enlightened but not able to enlighten others, we shall call the world whose light the apostles were.

26, p. 28.

II. 17 (11), p. 70. He does not say 'Let your light shine *before* God'; for if He were commanding this, He would be giving an impossible commandment; as if He were giving commandment to lamps as living things to let their light shine before the sun.

VI. 59 (38), p. 158. (On the Scripture meaning of κόσμος.) The Church is the ornament<sup>1</sup> of the world, since

<sup>1</sup> κόσμος.

also it is called the light of the world; Matt. v. 14 . . . but her ornament is Christ, the first Light of the world. We must consider whether it is of the same world that Christ is said to be the light and also His disciples. But when Christ is the light of the world, He is perhaps the light of the Church, but when the disciples are the light of the world, perhaps they are the light of those who call upon Him <sup>1</sup> who are other than the Church, as in 1 Cor. i. 2. If any one supposes that the Church is called the light of the world, i.e. of the rest of mankind and of unbelievers, this is possible if it is taken prophetically of the end; but if the present is meant, since the light of anything illumines the object of which it is the light, let them show how the rest of mankind is illumined by the Church sojourning in the world. If they cannot show this, let them consider whether our explanation is not sound—that the Church is light, and those who call upon (the Lord) are the world. The next sentence in Matthew will afford the explanation to the careful searcher of the Scriptures, ‘Ye are the salt of the earth’, perhaps ‘earth’ meaning the rest of mankind, of whom believers are the salt, being through their belief causes of the world’s preservation. The consummation will come to pass if the salt has lost its savour, and be no longer that which salts and preserves the earth . . . Matt. xxiv. 12; Luke xviii. 8.

Romans, Book X. 6, p. 672. He exhorts the disciples not to seek glory from men, but by living rightly and honourably to afford edification to those who see them, that God may be glorified who has opened to men a way of amendment and salvation.

<sup>1</sup> M. S. παρακαλουμένων but context implies ἐπικαλουμένων.

Cramer's Catena on 1 Cor. iii. 3-5 (J. Th. St. ix. 242). If we walk as the generality of men, we walk according to man ; but if we walk according to the words ' let your light shine before men ', we surpass the generality, and no longer walk according to man.

1 Cor. xiv. 12. (J. Th. St. x. 37.) It is probable that the operation of the gift is ineffectual, when it does not shine before men.

Origen, Apocalypse, Schol. ix. (T. U. xxxviii). He lights a lamp, who applies his mind to the true Light, and thence lights himself as a lamp. Therefore that he who lights the lamp may benefit those who are able, he sets it on the uttered <sup>1</sup> Word, as on a lamp-stand ; for so he will give light by teaching to those who have not yet had opportunity to be shone upon <sup>2</sup> by the true Sun.

Tertullian, Prescription of Heretics, 26. The apostles either disregarded this, or quite failed to understand it, if they failed to fulfil it by hiding any of the light ; i.e. of the word of God and the mystery of Christ.

Cyprian, Testimonies iii. 26. Heading ' It is not enough to be baptized and to receive the Eucharist, unless we progress in deeds and work.'

Eusebius, on Ps. xcvi (vi) 4. The Apostles and Evangelists shone upon the world like light. The true light is the Son Himself, enlightening all rational creation. They, having become partakers of the light coming from Him, are themselves called the light of the world.

Demonstration of Gospel, ii. 40, p. 73. Spoken of the Apostles. vi. 18, p. 289 (the city = the Church of Christ) ; so vii. 1, p. 326.

Clementine Recognitions, viii. 4. Peter says ' Those who

<sup>1</sup> προφορικῶς.

<sup>2</sup> καταυγασθῆναι.

‘speak the word of truth and illumine the souls of men, seem to me like the rays of the sun which when they have gone forth and shone upon the world can no more be concealed or at all hidden. They are not so much seen by men as themselves furnish sight to all.’

**Hegemonius**, 25 (22). We know that the light shines in the whole world and not in just some part; see Matt. v. 15. Whence comes ‘ingenerate darkness’?

v. 17f. **Irenæus**, IV. lvi. 1, H.; IV. xxxiv. 2, p. 275, M. He fulfilled all things by His coming, and still fulfils (perfects) in the Church even to the consummation the New Testament (Covenant) foretold by the Law.

**Ptolemaeus** ap. *Epiphanius* Haer. xxxiii, p. 219. See Introduction, ch. ii, p. 5f.

**Clement**, Strom. iii. vi. 46, 2. He came to fulfil it, not as though it were defective, but by the prophecies throughout<sup>1</sup> the Law becoming complete at His coming.

**Hippolytus**, Genesis, Frag. xxix (on Gen. xlix. 16). Our Lord by keeping the commandments, does not destroy the Law and the prophets, but fulfils them.

**Origen**, Numbers, Hom. xi. 2, p. 306. ‘Law’ is used both in a general and in a special sense. In the general sense, commandments, precepts, statutes, testimonies, judgments, are called ‘Law.’ In this sense it is said that the Saviour came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil; and elsewhere ‘Love is the fulfilment (fulness) of the Law—in which the name ‘Law’ is given to all the things written in the Law.

**Matthew**, Possinus’ Catena. As new-born children advance to manhood without their form being lost, but rather growing and becoming better shaped; so the

<sup>1</sup> κατὰ.



new covenant has come without the dissolution of the Law, only with its shaping and perfecting. The covenant in grace is the old one renewed and fully shaped.

Romans, Book II. 13, p. 490. He who lives according to the letter, is said to keep the Law; but he who lives according to the spirit is said to perfect or accomplish it;<sup>1</sup> but the perfection of the Law is in Christ Who said, 'I came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil.' Now to fulfil the Law is to perfect the Law.

III. 11, pp. 519-520, on Rom. iii. 20. None of the saints, nor the Lord Himself, destroys the Law; but its temporal and transient glory is destroyed and overcome by the eternal and abiding glory. Cp. 2 Cor. iii. 10.

Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 9. This is illustrated by His instruction to the leper; and (iv. 36) by His answer to the question 'What shall I do to possess eternal life?'

v. 14. Marcion has vainly laboured to deny this; if the Gospel has not fulfilled the Law, the Law has fulfilled the Gospel.

Chastity, vi. The *burdens* of the Law were only until John, not its *remedies*. The yokes of works are cast off, not those of disciplines. Liberty in Christ has done no wrong to innocence. There remains the whole Law of piety, holiness, humanity, truth, purity, righteousness, mercy, kindness, chastity. Blessed is the man who in this Law will meditate day and night.

Adamantius, ii. 18, p. 830. Adamantius denies that Christ contradicted the Law, giving illustrations of His repeating or extending it. It is clear that the Saviour came to fulfil the Law, though these say He came to destroy it. The Marcionite rejoins that the Judaists

<sup>1</sup> Perficere.

have written 'I came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil'; Christ really said 'I came not to fulfil the Law, but to destroy.' Adamantius rejoins that this is an audacious change of the Marcionites. The Marcionite proceeds to argue from John xiii. 34; Matt. ix. 15-17.

**Hegemonius** (xl). The verse is quoted against Manes. He denies that the Lord said it, finding that He has abolished the Law.

**Clementine Homilies**, iii. 51. That He said 'I came not to destroy the Law,' and yet manifestly does destroy it, signifies that what He destroyed was not part of the Law.

**Didascalia**, 26. The Law is therefore not abolished, but the traditional observance<sup>1</sup> of the Law belongs to time and is abolished. The Law = the Ten Commandments. The 'Jot' is the first letter of 'Jesus,' and I = 10. The 'tittle'<sup>2</sup> is the wood of the Cross. The 'Law' means then the Ten Commandments and the other judgments announced by God, before the people made the calf and served idols.

**Eusebius**, Gospel Demonstration, i. 7, p. 25. He did not transgress the decrees of Moses, but first put an end<sup>3</sup> to them, and became their Fulfiller. If He had been a transgressor of the Law of Moses, He would not have been believed to have been the Messiah. His new commandments would have had no weight, as they would seem to aim at covering transgressions.

VIII. 2, p. 387. Fulfilling Dan. ix. 24f. Christ is the completion (end<sup>4</sup>) of the Law, and all the prophecies concerning Him remained unfulfilled and

<sup>1</sup> δευτέρωσις (Mishna).

<sup>3</sup> Completion, τέλος.

<sup>2</sup> κεραία 'horn.'

<sup>4</sup> τέλος.

incomplete, until His coming put a completion to all that had been previously spoken of Him.

v. 18. Irenæus, I. i. 5, H. ; I. iii. 2, p. 14, M. The *Valentinians* say this refers to the Ten Aeons, signified by the I. with which Γησοῦς begins. So I. H. signifies the eighteen Aeons.

Hippolytus, Haer. viii. 5f (12f), x. 17 (13), gives Gnostic interpretation of Monoimus.

Clement, Frag. 58, Stählin (Nicetas' Catena on Luke xvi. 17). Perhaps through the 'jot' and the 'tittle' His righteousness cries 'If you come upright <sup>1</sup> to Me I will be upright to you ; if you walk crooked <sup>2</sup> I will also be crooked, saith the Lord of Hosts' ; (cp. Lev. xxvi. 21f) implying the punishments of the wicked to be crooked ways. For the way straight <sup>3</sup> and according to nature, which the 'jot' of Jesus implies, is His goodness, which is immoveable and unwavering <sup>4</sup> towards those who have believed in obedience. 'Neither the jot nor the tittle shall pass from the Law'—that is, neither the promise corresponding to those who are straight <sup>5</sup> nor the punishment threatened to those who go crooked.<sup>6</sup> Cp. Ps. cxxv. 5-6 ; xviii. 25-26 ; Prov. xxi. 8, LXX.

Origen, Ps. i. (Philocalia ii. 4). The wisdom of God has entered into every inspired Scripture as far as any and every letter. (Just as in the Creation God's workmanship is seen not only in the heavenly bodies, but in animals and plants of the earth), so we suppose in the case of all the things written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that the sacred Providence which bestows superhuman wisdom on mankind through the Scriptures, has implanted so to speak, saving oracles

<sup>1</sup> ὀρθοί.

<sup>4</sup> ἀρρεπής.

<sup>2</sup> πλάγιοι.

<sup>5</sup> εὐθέσι.

<sup>3</sup> εὐθεία.

<sup>6</sup> πλαγιάζουσι.

in every letter, according as it admits traces of wisdom.

So Jeremiah Hom. xxxix. (Philocalia, x. 1.) There is not one jot or one tittle written in Scripture which does not accomplish its own work for those who know how to make use of the meaning of the letters.

Exodus, Hom. i. 4, p. 131. In the Law and the prophets not one iota or 'apex' is lacking in mystery.

So Romans, Book II. 6, p. 481; IV. 2, p. 525; IX. 38, p. 660.

v. 19. Clement, Strom. ii. 19, 97, 2. This is the true Gnostic, who copies God as far as he can; temperate, patient, living righteously, lord over the passions, imparting of what he has, . . . doing good both in word and deed. He is greatest, in the kingdom, who does and teaches, copying God by bestowing the like.

Origen, Leviticus, Hom. vi. 3, p. 217. Knowledge alone is not enough.

Numbers, Hom. xii. 2, p. 314 (on Numb. xxi. 17-18). It is fitting that he should be teacher of the rest, who has first done what he teaches. To be great in the kingdom is to be king.

Judges, Hom. ix. 2, p. 478 (on Judges vii. 6). Christ's soldiers ought to work with both hand and tongue, that is word and work, according to Matt. v. 19.

Matthew (Latin) S. 2, p. 831. (This verse proves that some commandments are very small compared with others.)

1 Cor. vii. 18-20. (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. ix. 507.) He did not say 'shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven'; but 'shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven.' But where shall he be found who has loosed *two* commandments?

Cyprian, Epistle lxiii. 14. (Against those using only



*water* in the Eucharist.) If it is not permissible to break <sup>1</sup> the least of the Lord's commandments, how much more is it not right to infringe much greater ones, belonging to the very Sacrament of the Lord's Passion and of our redemption, or to change them by human tradition into anything else than has been divinely instituted !

lxxxvi. 6. (Last clause of verse applied to confessors in the mines.)

Testimonies, iii. 96 (quoted as from Gospel according to *John*). Deeds, not words.

v. 20. Irenæus, Haer. IV. xxiv. 1, H. ; IV. xiii. 1, p. 242, M. All these things (Matt. v. 21-2ff) do not involve contradiction and dissolution of the past, as the Marcionites proclaim ; but completion and extension, as He Himself says (v. 20). What is meant by ' more ' ? First, to believe not only on the Father but on His Son now manifested, for it is He who leads men into communion and unity with God ; then, not only to say, but also to do, ' for they said, but did not ' ; and not only to abstain from evil works, but also from desires of them. These things He taught as not contrary to the Law, but as fulfilling the Law and impressing its requirements upon us. It would have been contrary to the Law if He had bidden His disciples do the very thing which the Law had forbidden to be done. But what He did teach, to abstain not only from the things forbidden in the Law, but also from desires of them, is not contrary, and is not the work of one dissolving the Law but of one completing, extending and widening it. For the Law, being appointed for slaves, trained the soul through external, material things, dragging it on as

<sup>1</sup> Solve.

by a chain to obey the commandments, that man might learn to serve God; but the Word, liberating the soul, taught through it the body to be cleansed voluntarily.

**Clement**, Strom. VI. xviii. 164, 2. 'Except your righteousness exceed (that of) the scribes and Pharisees,' who are justified as regards abstinence from evil things, by your being not only found perfect in these points, but also able to love and benefit your neighbour, 'ye shall not be members of the Kingdom.'<sup>1</sup>

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, i. 23. Tertullian points out that the commandment to love one's neighbour ('debita bonitas') precedes that to love a stranger or enemy ('indebita bonitas'). The first principle<sup>2</sup> of goodness is to be shown to one's own interest,<sup>3</sup> from righteousness, but the second to another's interest, from superabundance of righteousness above the Scribes and Pharisees.

Idolatry, 2. We shall interpret 'idolatry' widely, as the Lord did with adultery and murder. How shall our righteousness abound above the Scribes and Pharisees as the Lord enjoined, unless we shall have realized the abundance of its adversary, unrighteousness, of which idolatry is the head?

Single Marriage, 7. Some say at one time that they have nothing to do with the Law which Christ did not destroy, but fulfilled; at another time they catch at what part of the Law they want. We clearly declare that the Law has so far come to an end, that its burdens, which according to the opinion of the apostles, not even the fathers were able to bear, have given place; but the parts which concern righteousness continue, not simply preserved but even enlarged, that our righteousness

<sup>1</sup> βασιλικοί.

<sup>2</sup> Ratio.

<sup>3</sup> In rem suam.

may be able to abound above the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees. And if righteousness, so also chastity.

**Origen**, Numbers, Hom. xi. 2, p. 305. What He wishes to be done by the Pharisees, He wishes much more and with greater abundance to be accomplished by the disciples; what He does not wish done by the disciples, He does not command even to the Pharisees. The sequel shows how He wishes more done by the disciples than the Pharisees do. The Pharisees keep 'Thou shalt not kill'; but He says to the disciples 'But I say unto you'—v. 22f.

v. 21f. **Tertullian**, Against Marcion, v. 17, on Eph. ii. 15–16. He made it void by fulfilling it: 'Thou shalt not commit adultery' is void, when it is said 'Thou shalt not look on any for lust.' 'Thou shalt not kill' is void, when it is said 'Thou shalt not speak evil.'

**Cyprian**, Testimonies, iii. 8. Heading 'Anger is to be conquered, lest it constrain to sin.'

**Origen**, on Proverbs vi. 4. (Mai, Bibl. Nov. Patrum). Sleep is the sin of the soul in operation; <sup>1</sup> drowsiness is the first unclean thought conceived in the soul. . . . So the Law forbids sleep, the Gospel drowsiness, since the one cuts off sin in operation, the other, the evil first conceived in thought. Cp. Matt. v. 21–2.

**Eusebius**, on Ps. lxx (lxxi) 14. (καὶ προσθήσω). He did not take away the first by bringing in the second, but made an addition as in Matt. v. 21f, 27f, and all such other things as have been handed down in His Church, receiving addition through the spiritual contemplation and interpretation of the Law.

<sup>1</sup> ὕπνος . . . : νυσταγμός.

Gospel Demonstration, ix. 11, p. 444. With diviner power than Moses had, He through the evangelists established His sacred Laws throughout the world, legislating with more than human authority, saying Matt. v. 21f, etc.

Prophetic Selections ii. 5. He ordained for us a new covenant. By divine and secret power He has been able to establish His Laws not over just one or two nations, nor over only some portion of the world, nor yet for a short time, but for ever and over all nations.

v. 22f. Irenæus, II. xlviii. 4, H.; II. xxxii. 1, p. 165, M. The Lord's teaching overthrows the impious opinion of heretics, that they ought to engage in all works, however evil.

(Irenæus runs through this part of the Sermon.) The Lord taught most carefully that some things were to be done, as good and excellent, others abstained from; not only acts but even thoughts which lead to acts, as evil, hurtful, and worthless.

Tertullian, *Flesh of Christ*, xiv. Christ did not use the daily phrase of all the prophets, 'Thus saith the Lord'; for He Himself was the Lord in person, pronouncing on His own authority, 'But I say unto you.'

Origen, on Eph. iv. 31. (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. iii. 55.) But since some think that anger sometimes arises with good reason, having added, but not well, 'without a cause'<sup>1</sup> in the sentence 'whosoever is angry with his brother shall be liable to the judgement'—for some have read 'whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause'—let us confute them from what precedes, 'let *all* bitterness and wrath . . . be put away from you.' The word 'all' is universal; no bitterness and wrath . . . are

<sup>1</sup> εἰκῆ.



allowed. . . . Therefore it is never reasonable to be angry with one another.

Jeremiah, Hom. xix. 15 (18), p. 261. If he who says to his brother 'Fool' shall be liable to the hell of fire, to what shall the adulterer be liable? I look for some means of punishment<sup>1</sup> greater than the hell of fire. I might perhaps say that hell is for involuntary sinners (or offences), who can be cleansed. But as in the case of the good, the righteous, 'it hath not come up into man's heart, what God hath prepared for them that love Him,' so 'it hath not come up into man's heart' what He hath prepared for them who sin by fornication and adultery. For if that to which he becomes liable who has said to his brother 'Thou fool,' has come up into the heart, it is clear that what has been prepared for those who have sinned in worse ways is greater than what comes up into the heart. But I cannot understand anything greater than hell, only I believe that what is prepared for adulterers is something greater than hell.

Matthew (Possinus' Catena). If he who simply calls the man a fool, is liable to the above punishments, is he not worthy of greater punishment who calls the believer this? for he has not only done despite to the believer *quâ* man, but also to the mystery of our faith. We ought to call believers prudent and wise, not fools and senseless.

Didascalia, ix. If any man has called a layman 'Fool' or 'Empty' (Raca) he is condemned by the Church as one of those who exalt themselves against Christ, for he has called his brother in whom Christ dwells 'Empty'—while he is not empty but full; or called him in whom the Holy Spirit of God dwells 'Fool'—while he is full

<sup>1</sup> *κολαστήριον*.

of all wisdom ; just as if he were a fool on account of the Spirit who dwells in him. (It is still worse to speak against a deacon or bishop.)

(Notice the interpretation of ' Raca ' as ' Empty.')

*vv.* 23-4. **Irenæus**, H. IV. xxxi. 1, H. ; IV. xviii. 1, p. 250, M. God needs no sacrifice from us, but he who offers is himself honoured in his offering, if his gift is accepted. For by a gift both honour and affection towards the king are shown, and the Lord, wishing us to offer in all simplicity and innocence, has proclaimed Matt. v. 23-4.

**Tertullian**, *Patience*, 12, quotes this as showing the need of patience.

**Cyprian**, *Unity of Church*, 13, adds, ' because God had no respect for Cain's offerings ; nor could he have God at peace with him, who had by discord of jealousy, no peace with his brother.' (The application is against schismatics.)

*Lord's Prayer*, 23. God does not accept the sacrifice of one at variance, and bids him return from the altar and first be reconciled to his brother, that God also may be appeased (*pacatus*) by peaceable prayers. A greater sacrifice to God is our peace and brotherly concord and a people made one by the unity of Father and Son and Holy Spirit. (Cyprian adduces sacrifices of Cain and Abel.)

**Origen**, *Prayer*, ii. 2, p. 198. (This applies to prayer.) For what greater gift can be sent up to God from His rational creature than the fragrant word of prayer, offered by a conscience that has nothing offensive from sin ?

**Numbers**, *Hom.* xxvi. 2, p. 370. Those who are in dissension cannot offer gifts to God.

**Didascalia**, ii. The offering to God is our Prayer and Eucharist (Thanksgiving). Therefore if thou bearest any

grudge against thy brother, or he against thee, thy prayer is not heard and thy Eucharist not accepted, and thou art discovered negligent in prayer and Eucharist, on account of the wrath thou indulgest. . . . Though thou pray three times an hour, thou wilt get no profit from it, for thou wilt not be heard on account of thy enmity against thy brother.

v. 25f. The *Carpocratians* used this passage to support their view that the soul must acquire experience of all actions, even the most vile; if it has not accomplished this during one life, it is sent into another body. This continues till complete experience is gained.

**Irenæus**, Hom. I. xx. 2, H.; I. xxv. 4, p. 104, M. The *Carpocratians* thus interpret this parable.

The adversary is one of the angels in the world, whom they call the devil, saying that he was made for the very purpose of bringing the souls that have perished from the world to the Ruler. He is the first of the creators of the world; He delivers such souls to another angel who ministers to him, to enclose them in other bodies; for 'prison' means 'body'. 'Thou shalt not go out thence, until thou pay the uttermost farthing' means that no one goes forth from the power of those angels who have framed the world. Souls continue to be reincarnated<sup>1</sup> until they have completed all sin; then when no sin remains, the soul will go to God who is above the angels who made the world. If however they have in one incarnation joined in all sins, they will not be reincarnated. (So Greek fragments.)

So **Epiphanius**, Haer. xxvii. 5, p. 106:

**Clement**, Strom. III. iv. 36, 1. (Against the *Antitactæ*, who seek to oppose the adversary, the Lawgiver.)

<sup>1</sup>μετεμσωματοῦσθαι.

IV. xiv. 95, 2. The Adversary is not the *body*, as some maintain, but the devil and those like him. He walks with us by means of men who are devoted to his works in this earthly life. It is thus not possible for them to avoid suffering most hateful things, who profess themselves to be Christ's but are engaged in the works of the devil. . . . 'The officer,' i.e. of the rule of the devil.

Excerpts from Theodotus, lii. This flesh the Saviour called 'adversary'. . . . The Saviour advises to get rid of him on the way, lest we fall into prison and punishment; but likewise also to agree with him—not nourishing and strengthening it by the power of sin, but ever from henceforth mortifying it and displaying it as fading by abstinence from evil.

Tertullian, Soul, 35. Carpocratians hold Metempsychosis to be necessary if all unlawful passions have not been satisfied in the first passage through this life. The soul must be called back as often as it has fallen short of this . . . until, repeatedly thrust into the prison of the body, it pays the uttermost farthing. This is his application of the Lord's allegory, which is really clear and simple. Our adversary is a heathen, walking with us in the way of our common life. If we were not to have intercourse with them, it would be necessary to leave the world. To him Christ bids you present goodness of heart, for He says 'Love your enemies, and pray for those who curse you'; lest provoked wrongfully in any business transaction he drag you to the Judge, and you being thrown into prison be constrained to the payment of the whole debt. But if the adversary means the devil, you are bidden . . . to enter into that harmony with him which belongs to the agreement of our faith—for you have promised to renounce him and



his pomps and his angels. This harmony will be by your keeping your promise, lest you again take anything of his which you have renounced, which you have restored to him ; lest he present you to the Judge, even God, as a cheat, a transgressor of your agreement ; as we read elsewhere of him as an accuser of the saints, and an informer (delator), as the very name 'diabolus' implies ; and the Judge deliver you to the angel of execution, and he commit you to a prison below, whence you shall not be released unless even a trifling sin be paid for by delay of resurrection (*nisi modico quoque delicto mora resurrectionis expenso*). Cp. also ch. 58.

Patience, 12 (literal interpretation). Patience is necessary. Who, proceeding with his enemy to the Judge, will get rid of the trouble by agreement, unless he have first blotted out anger and cut off harshness and bitterness, the veins (or 'poisons') of impatience ?

Origen, Matthew, Possinus' Catena. The 'adversary' has two meanings : (1) the devil ; (2) he who opposes our will. The devil is the first adversary ; the commandment the second. Christ exhorts to be reconciled with both ; with the devil by having in the judgement nothing of the things dear to him ; with the commandment, by having accomplished all the things commanded by it. Unless you come in this way to the judgement, you will pay the uttermost farthing.

Luke, Hom. xxxv. In Luke, four persons are mentioned. Adversary, Ruler, Judge, Exactor.<sup>1</sup> Matthew has a parallel ; it is not clear what difference is made by the omission of 'Ruler' and substitution of 'Officer' <sup>2</sup> for 'Exactor'. 'Lest he deliver thee' may

<sup>1</sup> πράκτωρ.

<sup>2</sup> ὑπηρέτης.

refer either to the Adversary or to the Ruler. Both say 'uttermost,' but Matthew has 'farthing', Luke 'mite.'

The Adversary is different from the other three. Origen refers, if any accept Scripture of this kind, to the angels of righteousness and unrighteousness disputing about the salvation or ruin of Abraham; and to the 'Shepherd' (Hermas, Mandate vii) who speaks of two angels present with every man—a good angel persuading to good, and an evil one to evil. The Saviour mentions the good angel, Matt. xviii. 10. . . . In the same way each of us has an adversary who rejoices when we sin; he walks with us, never leaves us, seeks opportunity to plot against, overthrow us, put evil thoughts in our hearts; so spoken of as '*thy* adversary'. The Ruler is explained by Deut. xxxii. 8 (LXX), Dan. x. 13, etc., as an angel-ruler of the nations. The work of each man's adversary is to lead us to this Ruler, and say 'O Ruler, e.g. of the Persians, I have kept this man who was under me for thee; no other has been able to transfer him, not even He who boasted that He had come for the very object of carrying off men from all these rulers and subjecting them to God's heritage.' But Christ our Lord has overcome all these princes, passed over their boundaries and carried off peoples captive to Himself for salvation. You were the portion of some ruler; Jesus came and rescued you. Thus our adversary walks about, to bring us to his own ruler. There is a meaning in 'Judge' having the article, and not 'Ruler', who is one of many. 'Thy adversary'—all are not adversaries to all; each has his own, who follows him everywhere. . . . 'Give diligence', which is the way to be freed from him; unless you labour with all your might, while still in the way, you will afterwards labour in

vain. So give diligence to be freed from him, whether the adversary or the ruler. Give diligence to have wisdom, justice, courage, temperance. . . . Unless you so labour, you will not be able to overcome the agreement of the adversary. 'In the way'; Christ says 'I am the way'; stand in Him. The adversary, or the ruler to whom the adversary delivers you, drags you to the judge. 'Drag' signifies that men are dragged struggling and unwilling to condemnation. The Judge can only be the Lord Jesus Christ. Matt. xxv. 33; x. 32-3. Each of us incurs a fine <sup>1</sup> for each sin, in proportion to the character of the sin; cp. Luke vii. 41; Matt. xviii. 24. If your sin is small you will incur the fine of a mite or farthing; but you must pay this. He who is faithful is smitten by no fine but is daily enriched. . . . The time of taking account is none other than the time of judgement, when it will be clearly known what has been entrusted to us, what gain or loss we have made. If we are found debtors, we must be dragged to the judge, and by him delivered to the exactor. We have each his own exactor. . . . If I have rendered to all their dues, I come to the exactor, and boldly answer, 'I owe you nothing'. If he comes to demand it, I resist him, for I know he has no power over me, if I owe nothing. But if I am a debtor, my exactor will cast me into prison. The law of the prison is that I do not come out, nor does the exactor suffer me to come out, unless I have paid the whole debt. The exactor has no power to let me off even a farthing, or the smallest portion; there is only One who can grant remission to debtors with nothing to pay—Luke vii. 41-2, viz. the Lord. In the prison you will be constrained by works and toil, or by pain and

<sup>1</sup> Damnum.

punishment, and not come out till you have paid the very last farthing or mite.<sup>1</sup> The word means 'slight', but our sins are gross. Blessed is, in the first place, he who sins not; in the second place he whose sin is comparatively slight. And even among slight sins there are differences. If we have owed a great sum of money, such as a thousand talents, how long we shall be shut up in 'prison' till we pay the debt, I cannot clearly state; infinite ages.

Romans, Book V. 2, p. 554. Although it is promised that at some time we shall come forth from prison, yet it is pointed out that this will not be till each has paid the uttermost farthing. But if even a farthing, the punishment for the least sin is not remitted except purged in prison and by punishments, how shall any be released by hope of impunity, or think that the gift of grace is liberty to sin?

Cyprian, Epistle lv. 20. It is one thing to stand for pardon, another to attain to glory; one thing when cast into prison not to go forth from thence till paying the uttermost farthing, another to receive straightway the reward of faith and virtue; one thing to be cleansed from one's sins by torment of long pain and to be purged long time by fire; another to have purged all sins by martyrdom; finally one thing to depend on the Lord's sentence in the day of judgement, another to be straightway crowned by the Lord.

Testimonies, iii. 57. Heading 'The believer is corrected and preserved.'

Praise of Martyrdom, xiii. Thou readest that it is written that we pay up to the uttermost farthing. But martyrs are exempted from this. For those who relying

<sup>1</sup> Tenue. Gk. λεπτόν.



on desires of eternal salvation have overcome cravings for life have been all exempted from pain by the Lord's promises.

On this difficult passage notice the variety of view. Besides (1) that of the Carpocratians and (2) the elaborate view of Origen, we find the adversary interpreted as (3) the flesh (Theodotus), (4) the devil (Clement, Tertullian, Origen), (5) the heathen or perhaps any adversary (Tertullian), (6) the commandment (Origen).

*v.* 27f. **Theophilus**, iii. 13, reads ἀλλοτρίαν = a strange woman or the wife of another.

**Clement**, Strom. III. i. 9, 1. The addition of the little word<sup>1</sup> 'I' shows the force of the commandment to be more stringent.

IV. xviii. 114, 2. Some one, calling himself a gnostic, said that in these words not bare desire was judged, but only if the natural effect of the desire was accomplished.

**Tertullian**, Soul, 40. The flesh is rebuked in Scripture, because the soul can do nothing without the flesh, in working, lust, gluttony. . . . The thoughts of sins, without carrying them into action, are usually assigned to the soul, as in this passage.

Resurrection of the Flesh, 13. (The flesh has a share even in thoughts not carried into action); they are carried on in the heart (or elsewhere in the body). So the Lord said 'In his heart'. Thus thought even without act and effect is action of the flesh.

Exhortation to Chastity, 9. (So even marriage is akin to 'stuprum'.)

**Origen**, Leviticus, Hom. iii. 3, p. 194. His heart has touched the sin (vitium) of lust, and his soul has become unclean.

<sup>1</sup> ἐγώ.

VI. 3, p. 216. Jesus' command is more perfect than the Law. The Law forbids murder, Jesus cuts out even anger; the law prohibits adultery, Jesus cuts off even lust of the heart.

Matthew, Possinus' Catena. The assent <sup>1</sup> to the sin is a kind of complete wickedness, even if it is not actually carried out. Hence the Saviour, shaking off from us the causes of sins, endeavours to cut off this; for if this is not in our souls the action will not be carried into effect.

Methodius, Leprosy vi. 45. (Bonwetsch, p. 314.) He named 'adulterer' the man who experiences passion, not him who has carried it out. He counsels to root out not the fruit of adultery, but the seed.

Didascalia, 1. The meaning is 'In the Law I have spoken through Moses, but now I Myself say to you. . .' He who has lusted has been judged as an adulterer.

Lactantius, Institutions, vi. 23. The mind becomes adulterous if it has depicted for itself even an image of pleasure.

v. 29f. Clement, Paed, III. xi. 70, 6. The Lord now summarily heals this passion, plucking up lust from its depths. But languishing looks, and looking askance, which is winking with the eyes, is nothing else but committing adultery through the eyes, the lust darting through them.

Tertullian, Idolatry, vii. (Against idol-makers receiving ecclesiastical office.) Let them consider whether it was said *figuratively*, 'If thy hand offend thee, cut it off'. What hands should be cut off rather than those in whom the Lord's body is offended?

Origen, Against Celsus, vi. 25, p. 649. Since we have

<sup>1</sup> συγκατάθεσις.

found the name Gehenna written in the Gospel for the place of punishment,<sup>1</sup> we have investigated whether it is found anywhere in the Old Scriptures, especially as the Jews also use the name. We have found mentioned in Scripture 'the valley of the son of Hinnom'; but in the Hebrew we have learnt 'the valley of Hinnom'<sup>2</sup> to be the same as Gehenna.<sup>3</sup> We find this was in the portion of the tribe of Benjamin, where was also Jerusalem. [See also Matt. § 16, p. 840.]

First Principles, iv. 3 (19), pp. 177-9. [Philocalia i. 19 (18). The verse is not to be taken literally.] It is impossible to accept from the Gospel that the right eye causes one to stumble. Granting that one may be caused to stumble by seeing, how is the blame to be referred to the *right* eye, when there are two eyes that see? But who, even on condemning himself at having seen a woman to lust after her, ascribing the blame to the right eye only, would reasonably cast it away?

Numbers, Hom. xxv. 3, p. 367. He certainly does not bid us to dig out the bodily eye or cut off our foot or hand, but He commands that the thought (*sensum*) be cut off, which thinks of carnal things and wantons with carnal desires; that our eyes may see what things are right, our ears hear what are right, our taste may taste the word of God, and our hands touch and handle the word of God.

Joshua, Hom. vii. 6, p. 414. Not our bodily hand . . . His meaning is that if I, who appear to you to be a right hand, and am named a presbyter, and appear to preach the word of God, shall have done anything against Church discipline and the rule of the Gospel, so as to

<sup>1</sup> *κολαστήριον*.

<sup>2</sup> *ἡ φάραγξ Ἐννόμ..*

<sup>3</sup> *Γέεννα*.

cause offence to you and the Church, let the whole Church agreeing with one consent cut off me, its right hand, and cast me from it. For it is better for you and for the Church to enter into the kingdom of heaven without me, your right hand, which has caused offence by evil action, than to go with me into hell.

**Clementine Recognitions**, vii. 37. He did not say 'Hath caused thee to stumble', that after having sinned you may cast aside the cause of sin. But 'if it cause thee to stumble,' i.e. that before sinning you may cut off the cause of sin which provokes and vexes you. But let none of you think, brethren, that the Lord commended amputation of bodily members. He wants the purpose to be cut off, and the causes which allure to sin, not the members. . . . Our eyes, meant by God to survey and testify of His work, should not promote evil passion.

v. 32. **Justin**, Apology, i. 15. Those who enter upon a second marriage by human law (after divorce) are sinners in the eyes of our Teacher.

**Clement**, Strom. II. xxiii. 145, 3f. (Cp. also Matt. xix. 9.) Because Scripture counsels to marry, and never enjoins to stand aloof from wedlock, it distinctly lays down 'Thou shalt not put away a wife except on account of fornication'. But it considers it adultery to marry again during the lifetime of the other separated party. *μοιχᾶται αὐτήν*—compels her *μοιχευθῆναι*. This is caused not only by him who has put her away, but by him who takes her, so giving occasion for the woman to sin.

**Lactantius**, Instit, vi. 23. Lest any should think that he may get round the divine commandments, these things are added—that he is an adulterer, who has married a wife put away by her husband, and also he who has, except on the charge of adultery, put away his wife in order to marry another.



The restriction 'except on account of fornication' was read here, not only by Clement and Lactantius but by *Theophilus* (iii. 13) and *Tertullian* (Against Marcion, iv. 34, 'praeter causam adulterii'. Chastity, 16, 'praeter causam moechiae'. Wife, ii. 2, 'nisi stupri causa'.)

v. 33. Origen, Exhortation to Martyrdom, vii. p. 278. 'I say unto you, Swear not at all' is to be borne in mind when we are tendered . . . the wicked oath 'by a man's Fortune' a thing which has no existence. For if he who swears by heaven transgresses against God's throne, and he who swears by the earth acts impiously by making a god of what is called 'the footstool of His feet', and he who swears by Jerusalem sins, although it is the city of the great King, and he who swears by his own head offends—how great a sin must it be regarded to be, to swear by the fortune of any?

Jeremiah, Hom. v. 12, p. 156. Origen compares this passage with Jer. iv. 2. Perhaps at first it is needful to swear 'in truth and in judgment and in righteousness'; that afterwards a man having made progress may become worthy of not swearing at all, but of having a 'yea' with no need of witnesses that this is so, and a 'nay' with no need of witnesses that this is not so.

Matthew, Possinus' Catena. Christ forbids oaths, that our life may be true and sincere. But if any shameless man does not believe us, we must say to him 'yea' or 'nay'.

Cramer's Catena ('Origen and Cyril'). If any shameless man puts an oath to the saints, the yea and the nay shall be to them instead of the oath.

Matthew (Latin) 110, p. 910 (on Matt. xxvi. 63-4) q.v.

On 1 Cor. xv. 31. (J. Th. St. x. 48.) It must be considered whether St. Paul here did not transgress the Gospel commandment, which says 'Swear not at all.'

**Eusebius**, Gospel demonstration iii. 3, p. 102. How could He rightly be called a deceiver, who deters from all falsehood, and exhorts to honour truth above everything, so as not to need even true swearing, much less false swearing. (Matt. v. 37.)

**Irenæus**, IV. iv. 4, H.; IV. ii. 5, p. 229, M. This is clearly spoken of the Creator, cp. Isa. lxvi. 1. Besides Him there is no other God; otherwise the Lord would not have called him either 'God' or 'the great King'. He would not be this if He had any superior, or was under another's power. So *Origen*, First Principles, II. iv. 1, p. 84.

**Origen**, First Principles, II. i. 3, p. 78. How is Heaven the throne of God, and earth the footstool of His feet, unless His power fills all things in heaven and earth, even as the Lord saith (Jer. xxiii. 24). (A good passage on *Divine Immanence* here.)

On Ps. xlvii (xlviii), 3. Matt. v. 34 agrees. Just as 'High' (Great) 'Priest' distinguishes from the priesthood under Him, so also 'the Great King'—for He is King of Kings.

**Clementine Homilies**, iii. 56. vv. 34–5 were spoken in answer to those who asserted that God was in the Temple.

v. 35. To those thinking, so Scripture teaches, that God swears, He said 'Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay.' . . .

v. 36. **Clement**, Paed. III. iii. 16, 4. None but God, saith the Lord, can make a hair white or black. How then do the godless create in rivalry with God, or rather strive violently to oppose Him; transforming the hair which He has made hoary?

**Tertullian**, De Cultu Feminarum, ii. 6. The Lord saith, 'Who of you can make a black hair of a white one, or a

white of a black ?' Therefore they surpass God ; ' behold ' they say, ' instead of black or white we make yellow ' ; although these women also strive to make black out of white, who regret that they have lived to old age.

**Cyprian**, *Dress of Virgins*, 16. The Lord saith, ' Thou canst not make one hair white or black '. You want to be superior, to overcome the word of your Lord ; with bold endeavour and sacrilegious contempt you die your hair ; with an evil omen for the future you already start flame-coloured hairs, and sin with your head, i.e. the nobler part of your body.

v. 37. **Clement**, *Paed II.* x. 103, 2. Scripture has indicated that what is superfluous<sup>1</sup> is of the devil.

**Strom.** VII. xi. 67, 4. ' Your yea shall be yea and your nay, nay ' is an epitome of justice (which makes a man deal truly throughout his life).

**Tertullian**, *Prescription of Heretics*, 26. (Against esoteric teaching ; not to handle the Gospel in various ways.)

*Against Praxeas*, 9. (Neither different names nor different things should be confused.) What is more, this is from evil.<sup>2</sup>

**Cyprian**, *Epistle lix.* 14. It does not befit the judgement of the priests to be blamed for lightness of unstable and inconstant mind, since the Lord teaches and says ' Let your speech be yea, yea ; nay, nay. '

**Clementine Homilies**, xix. 2. Peter acknowledges that there is a Ruler of Wickedness, the Evil One ; quoting the narrative of the Temptation ; Mark iii. 23 ; Luke x. 18 ; ' He that soweth the evil seed is the devil ' (Matt. xiii. 39). ' Give no occasion to the evil one ' ; ' Let your yea be yea, and nay, nay ; what is more than these cometh of

<sup>1</sup> τὸ περιττόν.

<sup>2</sup> a malo.

the evil one.' So in the Lord's Prayer—' Deliver us from the evil one '—and Matt. xxv. 41 ; and often.

Thus τοῦ πονηροῦ is taken *personally* by Clement and the Clementine Homilies. Tertullian is not clear.

vv. 38-9. Ptolemæus to Flora, iv. 5. (Epiph. Haer. xxxiii. 6.)

The part of the Law which is involved in injury is that appointed for vengeance and retribution of previous wrongdoers ; bidding eye to be struck out for eye, and tooth for tooth, and to requite bloodshed by bloodshed. For the second injurer is none the less a injurer, differing merely in order, but performing the same work. But this ordinance both was and is in other respects just, imposed because of the weakness of those who received a law<sup>1</sup> in deviation<sup>2</sup> from the pure law ; but foreign to the nature and goodness of the Father of the universe. Therefore this was abolished by the Saviour through contrary teaching ; for contraries abolish one another.

Tertullian, Patience, vif. Formerly they required eye for eye and tooth for tooth, and repaid with interest, evil with evil. Patience was not yet on earth, because faith was not there either. Impatience for a while made use of opportunities given by the Law. This was easy, while the Lord and Teacher of Patience was absent. But He subsequently came and united the grace of faith with patience.

If any attempt to provoke you with his hand, the Lord's counsel is at hand (v. 39). Let his outrageousness (inprobitas) be wearied by your patience, however much the blow may be bound up with pain and insult. You smite the outrageous man all the more by enduring ;

<sup>1</sup> τῶν νομοθετηθέντων.

<sup>2</sup> παρεκβάσει.



he will be beaten more severely by the Lord—by Him for whose sake (or, by whose grace) you endure.

Exhortation to Chastity, vi. 'Eye for eye and tooth for tooth' has now grown old from the time that 'Let none render evil for evil' has attained youthful vigour (juvenuit).

Origen, First Principles, iv. (18), p. 179. (Philocalia i. 19-18). (Against taking *v.* 39 literally.) That the right cheek is said to be smitten is most incredible, for every one who smites, unless he has suffered something contrary to nature, smites the left cheek with the right hand.

Celsus, vii. 25. Celsus, inspired by those who separate the Godhead of the Law and that of the Gospel, quotes the words of the Gospel, 'offer one who has once smitten to smite again,' but not the words of the Law, which this apparently contradicts. Origen gives full connection, but says that we have similar teaching in the Old Testament (Lam. iii. 27-30).

Exodus, Hom. x. 1, p. 166. The quotation may be from Exodus xxi. 24, or from Deut. xix. 21.

Adamantius, i. 16, p. 814. Megethius brings this forward as a contradiction. Adamantius replies that the teaching is harmonious. That of the Law was a deterrent against striking out one's neighbour's eye. Fear stopped strife. In the Gospel hindrance has been imposed in the same way to opposing and bearing a grudge on account of the slightest blow; (it enjoins) yielding and submitting. Here then we have fear and forbearance, both promoting peace; one man because of fear has ceased from fight, and another, through forbearance, has welcomed peace. But requitals are mentioned in the Gospel as well as in the Law. Matt. vii. 2f, 'with what measure ye mete' . . . x. 33, 'whosoever shall deny Me' . . . .

**Hegemonius**, 47 (42). Eye for eye, tooth for tooth is just; but that He bids one when smitten to offer also the other cheek, this is goodness. Is justice contrary to goodness? Far from it, but there is an advance from justice to goodness.

*vv.* 40-42. **Didache**, i. Whose smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him also the other, and thou shalt be perfect. . . . Give to every one that asketh thee, and ask not back; for the Father wills that gifts shall be given to all out of (or according to) His own gifts. Blessed is he who giveth according to the commandment, for he is blameless. Woe to him that receiveth; for if any having need receive, he is blameless, but he that hath no need shall give account, wherefore and with what end he received, and being put in confinement he shall be examined concerning the deeds which he has done, and he shall not come out thence till he has rendered the last farthing.

**Irenæus**, IV. xxiv. 2, H.; IV. xiii. 3, p. 243, M. The Lord bade us not only to be good in giving and sharing, but also voluntary bestowers upon those who take away what is ours (Luke vi. 29f); that we may not be grieved as if unwilling to be wronged, but may rejoice as having given willingly, rather affording favour to our neighbours than yielding to constraint. (Matt. v. 41) 'Go with him twain'—that you may not follow him as a slave, but go before him as a freeman, affording yourself in all things useful and helpful to your neighbours; not regarding their wickedness, but perfecting your goodness, fashioning yourself according to the Father, who makes His sun to rise on evil and good, and sends rain on just and unjust.

**Clement**, Strom. IV. x. 77, 3. It is commanded us to cling to nothing of the things of life, but to give also

the coat to him who takes the cloak ; not only that we may remain passionless, but that we may not by retaliating make our persecutors fierce against ourselves and stir them up to blaspheme the name on our account.

Rich Man, 31 (32). Such love of giving is indeed of God.

Luke vi. 27-8. Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 16. Marcion says that Christ teaches a new patience—forbidding the requital of injuries permitted by the Creator. Tertullian quotes in reply Isa. lxvi. 5, LXX.. ‘Say to those who hate you, Ye are our brethren.’ Christ adds to the teaching of the Creator supplements in agreement with it. . . . Thus to secure consistency, the object of ‘Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth’ must be not to allow a second injury for revenge, whereas revenge is forbidden ; but to restrain a first injury by setting forth its requital ; that each regarding the permission of a second injury might restrain himself from the first. Both sides are laid down in proportion to a man’s nature and faith ; that he who believes God might wait for vengeance from God, and he who has less trust might fear the requitals of the Law. . . . Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath and of the Law and all His Father’s ordinances, both revealed the intention of the Law and made it competent (*compotem*). If He who lays on us such principles of patience, will not Himself defend us, in vain does He teach patience, setting forth no reward for it, no fruit of patience, which is avenging. For by the fear of vengeance all iniquity is restrained.<sup>1</sup>

v. 42. Luke vi. 30 was perverted to favour indiscriminate lust, indiscriminate Baptism, and the payment of blackmail.

<sup>1</sup> Metu enim ultionis omnis iniquitas refrenatur.

Clement, Strom. III. vi. 54, 1. Carpocrates and others go in for unrestrained communism. But the next clause 'From him who would borrow of thee turn not away' refutes this. It is this kind of sharing (intercourse) that is meant, not the lustful. But how can he who asks and receives and borrows do this without there existing some one who has and gives and lends?

Tertullian, Single Marriage, 11. They will give wives and husbands like morsels to all who ask. That is their current interpretation of 'Thou shalt give to every one that asketh thee.'

Baptism, 18. Baptism must not be rashly given. 'Give to every one that asketh thee' refers simply to almsgiving.

Flight in Persecution, 13. He means in alms not in blackmail (concussura). He says 'to him that asks'. Now a blackmailer does not *ask*. He who threatens if he does not receive, does not ask but extorts. He does not look for alms, who comes not to be pitied, but to be feared. I will give therefore from mercy not from fear. . . . So 'he who shall take away thy tunic' refers to him who shall have sought to take away my *property*, not my *faith*. I will grant even my cloak to one who does not threaten my deposit (traditionem). If he has threatened it, I will demand again also my tunic. All the Lord's statements are limited by cases and rules; they do not apply without restriction and to everything. Just so He who bids that it should be given to every one that asks, does not Himself give a sign to them who ask. But if you think one should give indiscriminately to all who ask, you seem to me likely to give, I do not say wine to one suffering from fever, but even poison or a sword to one longing for death.

Luke vi. 30. Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 16.



Give to every one that asketh thee—viz. if he is needy—or at least all the more if needy. Cp. Deut. xv. 7–8.

Objection. 'The Creator commands to give to brethren, Christ to all who ask.' Answer: 'The Creator according to the natural order, first taught kindness towards neighbours, while going afterwards to extend it to strangers. There are two stages of goodness from the same author. So long as the mystery was only in Israel He justly commanded mercy towards brethren only; but when He gave the nations to Christ as His inheritance, Christ extended the Law of the Father's kindness to all.'

Cyprian, Testimonies, iii. 1. Heading 'Alms to be denied to none.'

Origen, John, Tome xx. 13, p. 324, and 17, p. 329, on John viii. 41. It is clear that he who once was a son of the devil can become a son of God, as Matthew makes plain by recording our Saviour's words, Matt. v. 43f. For consider how by loving one's enemies and praying for one's persecutors, he who previously was not a son of the Father in heaven afterwards becomes His son. Cp. 1 John iii. 8–10.

17 (15) on John viii. 42. 'That ye may *become* sons of your Father who is in heaven' shows that one who has not previously been son of the Father in heaven becomes His son. But notice '*your*'; is this spoken in simplicity, or is it a mistake of the copies? There would be no difficulty if it were simply '*the* Father'; but to become son of one's own Father, not simply of '*the* Father in heaven', seems to involve contradiction. For if He is his Father, he does not subsequently *become* His son; while if he *becomes* His son, He was not previously his Father. But possibly, since some of those recognized as having believed are called *servants* of God, while

others are named His sons, it is performance not of any commandment whatever but of some special things that renders their doer a son of God ; . . . Likeness to God and imitation of Him who loves all that are and abhors nothing that He has made. . . . (Wisdom xi. 24-6) is shown in loving one's own enemies, and praying for one's persecutors. ' That ye may become sons of your Father that is in Heaven ' would not well fit vv. 27-33. But now, as the Father in Heaven makes His sun rise on evil and good, so each of the sons of God, having love as it were a sun in himself, makes this rise even upon the evil when he loves his own enemies ; and again, as He rains upon just and unjust, so the saint sends down his prayer as it were rain upon those who are somewhere below him, because they persecute him, praying even for such.

Frag. xxxv (on John iii. 3). The birth from above <sup>1</sup> about which the Saviour teaches, comes from reception of virtue and keeping His commandments. For He says, Matt. v. 44f.

Clement, Paed. I. viii. 72, 3. He acknowledges His Father Who is good to be also the Creator ; but that the Creator is just is not disputed. He says ' My Father rains on just and unjust.' In that He rains, He is Creator of waters and clouds ; in that it is upon all, He holds the balance justly ; but as He is good, on just and unjust alike.

Strom. VI. xii. 104, 2. The full assimilation to God the Saviour comes upon the Gnostic, as he becomes, as far as is lawful for human nature, perfect as the Father in heaven. Cp. II. xix. 100, 4 ; IV. xiv. 95, 1.

Strom. VII. xiv. 85, 2. God makes His sun shine on

<sup>1</sup> ἄνωθεν.

just and unjust, and sent the Lord Himself to just and unjust. He Who strives to be like God, bearing no resentment but forgiving seventy times seven, is kind to every one.

**Origen**, First Principles, ii. 4, 1, p. 84. The Lord's words imply, to a man of the slightest intelligence, that He put forward no other God for the imitation of His disciples, save Him who made the heaven and bestows the rain.

iv. 4, 10 (37), p. 194. All the virtues, which are in God by essence, may be in man by diligence and by imitation of God, as the Lord shows in the Gospel, Luke vi. 36; Matt. v. 48. It is hence shown that while all these virtues are always in God, and can never be added or lost, they are gradually and individually gained by men; whence also they seem to have some kinship with God.

Against Celsus, IV. xxviii. p. 521. He exhorts us also that we may become His sons, to do the like, so as to extend our benefits as far as possible unto all men.

xxix. p. 522. The virtue (excellence) of God and men is the same. Therefore we are taught to 'become perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.'

Canticles, Hom. ii. 8, p. 20 (on ii. 4, 'ordinate in me charitatem') He said 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . . mind . . . soul . . . strength. And thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' He does not say 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour with all thy heart'. . . . Again, He says 'Love your enemies'; but did not add 'with all your heart.' The divine word is not extravagant, and does not enjoin impossibilities; it does not say 'Love your enemies as yourselves,' but only 'love your enemies.' It is enough that we love them and do not hate them. Love thy

neighbour as thyself ; love God from all thy heart—mind—soul—strength.

Ezekiel, Hom. i. 2, p. 355. God makes His sun to rise on good and evil, and rains on just and unjust ; not only the sun which we see with our eyes, but also that sun which is beheld with the eyes of the mind. I was evil, and the sun of righteousness has risen for me ; I was evil, and the rain of righteousness came upon me. The goodness of God is even in those things which are thought bitter.

Origen, Matthew, Possinus' Catena. The follower of Christ must follow Him in all things ; and as He makes His sun to rise on just and unjust, so he too must extend love to those who love him and those who hate him.

(Cramer's Catena). The follower of God and Christ makes the reason which is as a sun in him and the righteousness that shines in him, to rise on evil and good, and gives rain through the word of his mouth in due measure <sup>1</sup> on just and unjust, that is sinners.

Possinus' Catena. To love only those who love is imperfect ; it seems to be for the sake of gain, and not for that of virtue. But to love those who hate us, because of the very beauty of love itself, is beautiful and perfect.

Adamantius, i. 12, p. 812. Megethius says that what the Lord says in the Law is contradicted by our Lord, who is good. Adamantius says we find similar teaching in the Law itself. Exodus xxiii. 4-5 ; Numb. xvi. 46 ; 1 Sam. xxvi. 1f ; while He says in the Gospel ' Depart from Me ye that work wickedness.'

Tertullian, Patience, vi. Do you see what a Father Patience gains us ?

<sup>1</sup> οἰκονομικῶς.



Marcion, ii. 17. Though Marcion has ventured to erase from the Gospel also this testimony of Christ to the Creator, yet the world itself is inscribed with it, and it is read by every consciousness.

**Cyprian, Patience, 5.** Every one who is gentle, patient, and mild, is a follower (imitator) of God his Father. . . . So He said the sons of God become perfect, so He showed them to be consummated, and taught that they are renewed with heavenly birth, if the patience of God our Father remains in us. . . . What glory it is to become like God !

On Jealousy and Envy, 15. If it is a joyful and glorious thing for men to have sons like themselves, and they have more delight in having begotten them, if the offspring corresponds to the father in likeness of feature ; how much more joy is there in God the Father, when any one is so born spiritually that the divine nobility is proclaimed in his actions and praises !

**Clementine Homilies, iii. 57.** Spoken against those who believe God to be evil.

xviii. 2. Simon says ' This is most unjust, that He bestows the same to just and unjust.' Peter answers, ' Do you then next tell us how He would act if good. He who bestows the same to the good and just, and yet again to evil and unjust, is according to you not even just ; if He bestowed good things to good men, but evil things to evil men, you would reasonably say He was just.' (Peter's explanation is that God bestows temporal things on the evil, if haply they may reform ; but eternal things on the good, if they persevere.)

Luke vi. 34f. **Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 17.** ' Lend.' In the Old Testament the fruit of a loan, viz. usury is abolished. So a man was trained, it may be, to lose also his loan.

Ezek. xviii. 7 ; Deut. xxiv. 12-13, xv. 2, involves remission of debt to those unable to pay.

35. (Marcion disliked marriage.) There is nothing more shameless than for Him to make us His sons, Who has not allowed us to obtain sons, by taking away marriage. . . . How is God kind, who had not been known heretofore, and from whom no benefits had proceeded ?

36. Tertullian reads ' as your Father who is merciful to *you*.' He quotes from the Old Testament—Isa. lviii. 7, i. 17.

Matt. vi. 1. Origen, Possinus' Catena on Matthew. As water ever fights with fire, and fire with water, and such things can never co-exist together ; so vain-glory and virtue are contrary to one another, and can never co-exist in the same soul. We must then expel vain-glory from our souls, and abide in the commandments of Christ.

v. 2. Eusebius, on Ps. lxx (lxxxix) 4 (3). To sound a trumpet means to cry aloud and announce to all, as our Saviour's words teach.

v. 3. Theophilus, To Autolycus, iii. 14. He teaches those who do good not to boast, that they may not be men-pleasers.

Clement, Strom. IV. xxii. 138, 4. ' If thou doest alms,' saith He, ' let no man know ; and if thou fastest, anoint thyself that God alone may know,' but not one single man ; nor ought even he who does mercy to know that he is doing mercy—for in that case he will be merciful at one time, not at another.

Origen, Ps. xxxvi (vii), Hom. i. 6, p. 659. He who is righteous according to the Lord's commandment does his righteousness in the way He Himself commanded, saying ' But ye, when ye do your righteousness, let not

the left hand know what the right hand doeth'. . . . This righteousness, therefore, which is done in such a way as not to appear to men, but in secret, that the Father who seeth in secret may reward openly in His own time, is brought forth by God as the light.

Cramer's Catena on Matthew. The left hand knows the right and fit work, when it is polluted by love of glory.

*vv.* 4-5. Cyprian, Testimonies, iii. 40. 'Not to work ostentatiously or excitedly' (tumultuose).

Didascalia, 11. Because the heathen are to stand on the left hand, He has named them 'the left.' The heathen are to know nothing of your law disputes; you are to receive from them no witness against yourselves, and are not to be tried before them.

15. The widow who has received alms from the Lord, may pray for him who has rendered her the service, but not mentioning his name, that his blessing may be with God and not with man, as He has said in the Gospel (*v.* 3); lest haply when you publish the name by praying for the giver, his name may be generally known and come to the ears of a heathen . . . who is a man of the *left*.

*v.* 5. Origen, in Possinus' Catena. It is not evil to pray on the road. It is good to pray and to do good on the road and in bed and at table and 'in every place of His dominion.'

*vv.* 5-8. Origen, Prayer, xix. 2, p. 228ff. Our Saviour, it is clear, everywhere opposes love of glory as a deadly disease. He does so here, warning against performing in the time of prayer the work of hypocrites, for it is the work of hypocrites to seek to plume themselves before men for piety or liberality.

Even what would be regarded as good and praise-

worthy is defiled when we do it that we may be glorified by men, or seen of men. Wherefore no reward from God follows us for this. For every word of Jesus is unerring <sup>1</sup> and if I must speak strongly, it becomes more unerring, when it is spoken with His accustomed oath. . . . As the rich man in Luke received <sup>2</sup> his good things during his human life, and because he had received them was unable to meet with them any longer after the present life ; so he who has received his reward if he gives to any or offers prayers, sows to the flesh, not the spirit, and will reap corruption, not eternal life.

‘ All who go along the broad and wide road which leads to destruction, which is not straight but crooked, pray in the corners of the broadways.’

xxi. 1. If there is any difference between Church and Synagogue, he who loves (or is wont <sup>3</sup>) to pray in the synagogues, is not far from the corners of the broadways. Not so is the holy man ! he is not wont <sup>3</sup> to pray, but loves <sup>4</sup> to do so, and not in synagogues but in churches, and not in corners of broadways but in the straightness of the narrow and straitened way ; not that he may be seen of men, but that he may appear before the Lord God.

(Origen apparently takes *φιλεῖν* in sense of ‘ be wont ’, *ἀγαπᾶν* being stronger.)

Notice *φανῶσιν* = be seen or appear. Nothing that ‘ appears ’ is really good. Like actors in theatres, these act in their own theatre, the synagogue and corners of the broadway. But he who is not a hypocrite (actor) enters into his chamber, where he has, shut in, the treasures of wisdom and knowledge ; and closing the

<sup>1</sup> *ἀψευδής*.

<sup>2</sup> *ἄπεςχεν*.

<sup>3</sup> *φιλεῖ*.

<sup>4</sup> *ἀγαπᾶ*.



door of his senses, that he may not be drawn away by sensations nor may the ideas of them come upon his mind, prays to the Father who does not shun such secrecy.

v. 7. But in prayer let us not babble <sup>1</sup> but speak of God.<sup>2</sup> We babble, when not examining ourselves or the words of prayers which we send up, we speak of corrupt acts or words or thoughts . . . foreign to the Lord's incorruption. . . . According to the letter of the Gospel, it is only the heathen who babble, having not even any conception of great or heavenly petitions, sending up every prayer for bodily and external things. So he is likened to a babbling heathen, who asks the things below from the Lord who dwells in heaven and above the heights of heaven. He who speaks much is likely to babble, and he who babbles to speak much. God is one, but shameful things are many; truth is one, but falsehoods are many. Therefore we must not make our prayers like the heathen, who babble or speak much; for the God of the saints, being the Father, knows what things His sons need, since these things are worthy of the Father's knowledge.

**Tertullian**, Prayer, 1. Christ's heavenly wisdom is shown in the first place by the command to worship secretly, by which (1) He required faith from man, to trust that both the sight and the hearing of Almighty God are present even under a roof and in a hidden spot, and (2) He called for soberness of faith, to offer its religion to Him alone whom it trusted as hearing and seeing everywhere. So in the next command wisdom must equally be concerned with faith and soberness of faith, if we think that we should not approach the Lord

<sup>1</sup> βαττολογήσωμεν.

<sup>2</sup> 'Speak divine things' θεολογήσωμεν.

with an array of wants, since we are assured that He of Himself provides for His own.

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer, 4. The Lord as our Teacher commanded us to pray secretly, in hidden and sequestered places, in our very chambers, which is more in accordance with faith, that we may know that God is everywhere present, hears and sees all men, and pierces in the fulness of His majesty into hidden and secret things.

**Eusebius**, on Ps. lxxv (lxxvi) 17. God hears even the silent, and there are cries of the soul not uttered with the tongue but sent up with secret power to God, as the Lord taught, Matt. vi. 6-7.

**Clementine Homilies**, iii. 55. To those who suppose that God does not foreknow, He said 'Your heavenly Father knoweth that you have need of all these things before you ask Him.' But to those who believe, as the Scriptures say, that He does not see all things, He said 'Pray in secret, and your Father who seeth the secret things will reward you.'

v. 8. **Origen**, Prayer, v. p. 204f. Those who reject prayer say 'God knows all things before their birth,' and nothing first becomes known to Him by its being present as though not known previously. What need then is there for us to send up prayer to Him who knows what we need even before we pray? It is reasonable that He, the Father and Creator of the universe, who loves all things that are, and hates none of the things that He has made (Wisdom, ii. 25) administers each man's affairs for his well being, even without his praying, as a father provides for his babes without waiting for their request.

(Origen deals with the above question at great length.)

xvii. 2, p. 226. God knows before we ask the things we need because of our perishable body.

v. 9. **Clement.** Paed. I. viii. 73, 1. (The Father is the Creator.) The Lord says in the Prayer 'Our Father who art in the heavens'; but the heavens belong to Him who created the universe; so it is incontestable that the Lord is the Son of the Creator.

Prophetic Selections, xix. 1. A man who has advanced from faith and fear to knowledge, knows how to say 'Lord, Lord . . .' but not as the slave; he has learnt to say 'Our Father'—being freed from the spirit of bondage that is unto fear—being advanced by love unto adoption.

So **Origen**, Matthew (Latin), 2, p. 831. Every one who says 'Our Father who art in heaven' ought not to have the spirit of bondage in fear but the spirit of adoption. But he who has not the spirit of adoption and yet says 'Our Father who art in heaven,' speaks falsely, since he is not a son of God and yet calls God his Father.

First Principles, II. iv, p. 84. Saying that those who pray ought to say 'Our Father who art in heaven', He means that God is to be sought in the better parts of the universe, that is of His own creation.

Prayer, xxii, p. 231. Origen cannot find any prayer in the Old Testament addressed to God as Father, though God is there called 'Father,' and those who have thought to have believed God are called sons, as Deut. xxxii. 6, 18, 20; Isa. i. 2; Mal. i. 6. Yet the security and unchangeability of sonship does not appear there; these passages blame them who are called sons; cp. Gal. iv. 1-4. In the coming of Christ these will receive full adoption—Rom. viii. 15; John i. 12; 1 John iii. 9. If we consider what is written in Luke, 'When ye pray, say "Father",' we shall shrink from uttering these words without being genuine sons, lest in addition

to our other sins we become liable to the charge of impiety—cp. 1 Cor. xii. 3. So every one begotten of God and not doing sin—(by partaking of the seed of God, which turns from all sin)—says by his actions ‘Our Father who art in heaven,’ the Spirit Himself bearing witness with their spirit that they are children of God and His heirs (Rom. viii. 16–17). But that these may not only half say ‘Our Father,’ along with their works their heart also, the spring and origin of good works, believes to righteousness; harmonizing with which their mouth confesses to salvation. Every deed, word and thought of theirs has copied the image of the invisible God, and has become according to the image of the Creator. . . .

If we understand the meaning of ‘Pray without ceasing,’ let our whole life, as we pray without ceasing, say ‘Our Father who art in heaven’. . . . Heaven is the throne of God because His Kingdom has been established in all who wear the image of the heavenly and have therefore become heavenly. We must not suppose Him to dwell in heaven, circumscribed in a bodily form, as if He were less than the heavens containing Him. All things consist by Him. Phrases which appear to show God to be in a place must be treated in a manner befitting great and spiritual conceptions of God; cp. John xiii. 1–3; xiv. 28; xvi. 5. These are not to be taken literally any more than xiv. 23.

Origen aims at removing the low conception of God held by those who suppose Him to be locally in heaven. To allow Him to be in a corporeal place, means that He must be a body, and therefore corruptible and divisible.

xv. 1, p. 222. He thus teaches us to pray not to Himself but to the Father. If prayers are offered to



both Father and Son, it would be in the plural, which is not Scriptural. This would only be natural if the Son were different in essence.<sup>1</sup> We must then pray to God the Father of all, but not apart from the High Priest.

Luke (Gallandi and Corderius). I think none would say to God 'Father,' without having been filled with the Spirit of adoption. A son glorifying the Father would say 'Father,' but this would be after keeping the commandment which says 'Love your enemies, pray for them that persecute you, that ye may become sons of your Father which is in heaven.'

Tertullian, Prayer, 1. Our Lord Jesus Christ marked out for new disciples of the new covenant a new form of prayer.

ii. It begins with the testimony of God and the reward (meritum) of faith. We both pray to God, and we commend faith, whose reward is the title of sons of God (John i. 12). Yet very frequently the Lord declared God to be our Father; nay, He also commanded to call no one Father on earth save Him whom we have in heaven. Therefore by thus worshipping we fulfil a commandment. Happy are they who know the Father—contrast Isa. i. 2. The name 'Father' is one of dutious affection (pietas), and of power. Also in the Father, the Son is called upon. Nor is our mother the Church passed over.

Against Praxeas, 23. God is everywhere, but chose heaven as His abode (seat<sup>2</sup>).

Cyprian, Lord's Prayer, 8f. Most especially the Teacher of peace and unity would not have prayer made separately and privately, that each in prayer should pray for himself alone. We do not say '*My* Father

<sup>1</sup> ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν.

<sup>2</sup> Sedes.

who art in heaven'—'give *me my* bread to-day'. . . Our prayer is public and common; when we pray, we pray not for one, but for the whole community, because we—the whole community—are one; cp. 'The Three Children' praying 'as from one mouth'; and the Apostles, Acts i. 14.

**Our Father.** The new man, regenerated and restored to his God by His grace, says 'Father' in the first place, because he has now begun to be a son; cp. John i. 12. He therefore who has believed in His Name and become a son of God, ought to begin with this, to give thanks and profess himself a son of God, naming as his Father God in heaven, and testifying among the first words of his new birth, that he has renounced his earthly father according to the flesh and has recognized and begun to have as his Father only Him who is in heaven.

*Our Father*, viz. of those who believe, those who, sanctified by Him and restored by birth of spiritual grace, have begun to be sons of God. He has begun to be *our* Father, and ceased to be the Father of the Jews who have forsaken Him—(John viii. 44; Isa. i. 2).

When we call God 'Father' we ought to act as sons of God, that as we delight in God as Father, so He may also delight in us. Let us conduct ourselves as Temples of God, that it may be clear that God dwells in us.

xviii. He is the Father of those who understand and believe.

Epistle xi. 7. Let each pray to God not for himself alone, but also for all the brethren, as the Lord taught us to pray, when He delivers not a private prayer to individuals, but bade those who pray to pray for all in common and harmonious prayer.

Cyprian repeatedly speaks of the Lord's Prayer as 'the Daily Prayer'—Test. iii. 19, 22 ; Mortality, 18.

v. 9. (*Hallowed be Thy Name.*)

Origen, Prayer, 24. This implies that the Name has not yet been hallowed. A name is a summary appellation, presenting the special characteristic<sup>1</sup> of what is named. There is, e.g. some special characteristic of Paul the Apostle, some special characteristic of the *soul*, by which it is what it is ; so of the *mind*, the *body*. As man's characteristics may change, so their names change in Scripture (Abram becomes Abraham ; Simon, Peter ; Saul, Paul). But God being unchangeable, His name is always the same. Since then all have some conception of God, but not all conceive of Him as He is ; for they are few, and if I may say so fewer than the few, who comprehend His holiness in all things ; we are with reason taught that our conception of God should become holy, that we may see His holiness as He creates, and provides, and judges and chooses, and forsakes and receives and turns away, and honours with reward, and punishes according to each man's deserving. In these and such like features is seen the peculiar character of God, which I consider in Scripture is meant by the Name of God, cp. Exodus xx. 7 ; Deut. xxxii. 2-3 ; Ps. xliii. (xliv) 18. . . . As here the man who prays asks that God's name may be hallowed, so in Ps. xxxiii (iv) 4, is said, ' Let us exalt His Name together.' The imperative is used instead of the optative, as often in the LXX.

Cp. also xxv. 2, below.

So Canticles, Hom. i. 3, p. 13.

Tertullian, Prayer, 3. The Name of God the Father had been delivered to none—not even to Moses. It has

been revealed to us in the Son . . . cp. John v. 43, xii. 28, xvii. 6. We ask that it may be hallowed. Not that it becomes man to wish well to God, as though there were Another from whom the wish could be granted for Him, or He were in trouble if we do not wish. Certainly it is fitting that God should be blessed in every place and time on account of remembrance of His benefits, due from every man. But this too serves the place of a blessing. But when is not the Name of God holy and hallowed of itself, since it hallows others from itself; to whom that surrounding throng of angels ceases not to say 'Holy, Holy, Holy'? So then we also, candidates for angels, if we deserve this, are already learning that heavenly word spoken to God, and the duty of our future glory. . . . As for our petition, when we say 'Hallowed be Thy Name,' we ask that it may be hallowed in us who are in Him; and also in all others for whom the grace of God still waits, that we may obey this command also by praying for all, even for our enemies. Therefore we do not say 'Hallowed be it in us' but imply 'in all.'

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer, xii. Not that we wish for God, that He may be hallowed by our prayers, but that we ask of Him that His Name may be hallowed in us. By whom is God hallowed, Who Himself hallows? But because He said 'Be ye holy, since I also am holy,' we ask and seek that we who have been hallowed in baptism, may persevere in what we have begun to be. And this we pray daily, for we need daily hallowing—that we who daily sin may cleanse away our offences by constant hallowing. But what the hallowing is which is bestowed on us by God's grace, the Apostle proclaims (1 Cor. vi. 19-20). We pray that this hallowing may abide in us; and because our Lord and Judge warns the



man healed and quickened by Him to sin no more, lest some worse thing come to him, we make this petition into constant prayers, ask for this day and night, that the hallowing and quickening, which is received of God's grace, may be preserved by His protection.

*v. 10. Thy Kingdom come.*

Origen, Prayer, xxv. 1, p. 238f. If 'the Kingdom of God,' according to the word of our Lord and Saviour, 'comes not with observation, neither shall they say Lo here! or Lo there!, for the kingdom of God is within you'—for the word is very nigh, in our mouth and in our heart;—it is clear that he who prays for the kingdom of God to come naturally prays for the Kingdom of God to arise in him and bear fruit and be perfected; so that every saint is ruled over by God and obeys the spiritual laws of God, administering himself as a well-ordered city, the Father being present with him and Christ reigning with the Father in the perfected soul—over which among sinners the ruler of this world tyrannizes. . . .

But some one will say of both 'Hallowed be Thy Name' and 'Thy Kingdom come' that if he who prays, prays on condition of being heard and is heard, the Name of God will be hallowed for him, and to him the Kingdom will be present. Why then should he pray for present things as though not present? . . . Answer: As he who prays to receive the word of knowledge and the word of wisdom, fitly always prays for these, being sure of always receiving by the hearing of his prayer greater insight <sup>1</sup> of wisdom and knowledge, yet knowing only in part . . . so the perfection of the hallowing of the Name of God by each of us, and of the presence of His

<sup>1</sup> θεωρήματα.

Kingdom, is not possible until the perfection of wisdom and knowledge comes. . . . The highest point of the kingdom of God in us will come to those who are continually advancing, when Christ, all enemies being subdued to Him, will deliver up the Kingdom to God and the Father.

The Kingdom of God is incompatible with the kingdom of sin. If we wish God to reign over us, let not sin reign in our mortal body . . . but let us bring forth the fruits of the Spirit . . . that the Lord may walk in us . . . all His enemies in us becoming His footstool, even Death itself.

Luke (Gallandi and Corderius). That every rule and authority and power may be put down, yea, and moreover every kingdom of the world, and the sin that reigns in our mortal bodies, and that God may reign over all of these.

Romans, Book II. 14, p. 499. We express a wish, not a command. (Imperative=Optative.)

v. 3, p. 555. In the Lord's Prayer we are taught to say 'Thy Kingdom come' as though it has not yet come. So the Lord at the beginning of His preaching did not say 'The Kingdom of heaven has come', but 'is at hand'. The present time is not so much that of the Kingdom as of war, by which war the future kingdom is sought.

**Tertullian**, Prayer, v. (He puts 'Thy will be done' before 'Thy Kingdom come'.)

'Thy Kingdom come,' i.e. in ourselves just as 'Thy will be done'. For when does not God reign, in whose hand is the heart of all kings? But whatever we wish for we anticipate (auguramur) for Him, and attribute to Him what we expect from Him. So if the manifestation<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Repraesentatio.

of the Lord's Kingdom belongs to the will of God and to our own expectation,<sup>1</sup> how do some pray for some protraction of the world, whereas the Kingdom of God which we pray may come, belongs to the consummation of the world?

We wish to reign more speedily and to be no longer servants. Even though it had not been laid down in the Prayer to ask for the coming of the Kingdom, we should have uttered the word of our own accord, hastening to embrace our hope. Cp. the cry of the martyrs under the altar, Rev. vi. 10. Certainly their avenging is regulated by the end of the world. May Thy Kingdom come, O Lord, most speedily; the prayer of Christians, the confusion of the heathen, the exultation of angels, for which we are afflicted, nay, for which we pray.

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer, xiii. 10. We ask that the Kingdom of God may be manifested to us. . . . For when does not God reign, or when does that begin with Him whichever was and never ceases to be? We ask for the coming of our Kingdom, promised us by God, gained by Christ's Blood and Passion; that we who have been servants in this world may hereafter reign under the Lordship of Christ, as He Himself promises (Matt. xxv. 34). And it may be that Christ Himself is the Kingdom of God, Whom we desire daily to come, Whose coming we wish soon to be manifested to us. For since He is the Resurrection, because we rise again in Him, so also He may be understood by the Kingdom of God, because we are to reign in Him. But we do well in seeking the Kingdom of God, that is the heavenly Kingdom, because there is also an earthly kingdom. But he who has already renounced the world, is superior to its honours

<sup>1</sup> Suspensionem.

and kingdom. Therefore he who dedicates himself to God and Christ, longs not for earthly but for heavenly kingdoms. But we need constant supplication and prayer, that we may not fall away from the heavenly kingdom, as the Jews have done, to whom this was first promised (Matt. viii. 11-12). . . . So we Christians, who have begun in prayer to call God 'Father', pray also that the Kingdom of God may come to us.

v. 10. 'Thy will be done, as in Heaven, so in earth.'

**Clement**, Strom. IV. viii. 661. The earthly Church is the image of the heavenly; wherefore we pray that God's will may be done also in earth as in Heaven.

**Origen**, Prayer, xxvi. 1. This clause is omitted by Luke, being read in Matthew only. Let us, who pray while still on earth, understanding that God's will is done in Heaven, among all those of the household of heaven, pray that God's will may be done in all things by us also on earth, just as by them; which will be the case if we do nothing contrary to His will. But when the will of God shall be accomplished by us also on earth, as it is in Heaven, we, being made like them in Heaven, as wearing like them 'the image of the heavenly', shall inherit the kingdom of Heaven; those who are after us on earth praying to be made like us who have come to be 'in Heaven'.

But 'as in Heaven, so in earth' can be taken of all three petitions together; so that what we are bidden to say in the prayer may be 'Hallowed be Thy Name, as in Heaven so on earth'; 'Thy Kingdom come, as in Heaven so on earth'; 'Thy will be done, as in Heaven so on earth'. For God's Name has been hallowed by those in heaven, God's Kingdom is present to them, God's will has been done in them; all which things remain for us on earth, but can be for us by our



making ourselves worthy to find God ready to hear us as regards all these things.

But the questions may be raised ' How has the will of God been done in Heaven, where are the " spiritual (hosts) of wickedness " (Eph. vi. 12) because of whom the Lord's sword shall be drunken even in Heaven (Isa. xxxiv. 5) ? ' If thus we pray that the will of God may be done in earth as it is in heaven, we may be unconsciously praying that the adversaries <sup>1</sup> (oppositions) may continue on earth, whither they come from heaven, since many evil things are done on earth because of the victorious spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. . . . So any one allegorizing ' heaven ', and saying that it is Christ, while the earth is the Church—(who is so worthy a throne of God as Christ, or what is a footstool of God's feet like the Church ?)—will easily solve this question, saying that we ought to pray that each of those belonging to the Church may give such course <sup>2</sup> to the Father's will as Christ has given course to it—Who came to do His Father's will and accomplish it all. It is possible, cleaving to Him, to become one spirit with Him (1 Cor. vi. 17), therefore giving course to the will, that as it has been accomplished in heaven, so it may be on earth. . . . This interpretation is not easily despised by one who carefully considers it.

But against it may be alleged Matt. xxviii. 18. Having already authority over the things in heaven He says He has received in addition that on earth; the things in heaven have been previously enlightened by His word; but at the consummation of the age those also on earth, because of the power given to the Son of God, will be set right, following the example of the things over which

<sup>1</sup> τὰ ἐναντία.

<sup>2</sup> χωρῆσαι.

the Saviour received authority in heaven. Just as if He wishes to take His disciples, as fellow-workers through their prayers, to the Father, that just like the things in heaven subjected to truth and reason <sup>1</sup> He may bring the things on earth to a blessed end, set right in virtue of the power which He received 'as in heaven, so on earth'. But he who maintains that the heaven is the Saviour and the earth the Church . . . might find that it is Christ's Manhood which He assumed which says after the Resurrection 'All power is given Me in heaven so on earth'.

Not because of His place but because of His choice <sup>2</sup> he who is still on earth but having his citizenship in heaven, laying up treasure in heaven and having his heart in heaven, wearing the image of the heavenly, is no longer of the earth nor of the world below, but of the heaven and the better heavenly world. So the spiritual (hosts) of wickedness, dwelling in the heavenly places, but having their citizenship on earth by their plottings and wrestlings against men, laying up treasure on earth, bearing the image of the earthy, are not heavenly nor dwell in the heavens, because of their vile disposition. Whenever, then, it is said 'Thy will be done as in heaven, so on earth', these must not be reckoned as being in heaven, since they have fallen thence in mind along with him who fell from heaven like lightning.

(Perhaps 'heaven' and 'earth' have here not a local meaning), the meaning being that all the things 'on earth', i.e. inferior and associated with earthly things, should be made like all those which are superior and have their citizenship in heaven. He who sins, wherever he may be, is earth, and will go to the earth which is

<sup>1</sup> λόγῳ.

<sup>2</sup> προαίρεσιν.

akin to him, if he repents not ; but he who does the will of God and does not disregard the saving spiritual laws is heaven. If then we are still earth because of sin, let us pray that the will of God may so extend to us in reformation, as it has come to those who before us have become heaven or are heaven ; or if we are already reckoned by God as not earth but heaven, let us ask that just as in heaven so also on earth—I mean in worse men—the will of God may be accomplished, in order to make it heaven ; that there may be no longer earth, but that all may become heaven. For if, according to this interpretation, the will of God is done as in heaven so on earth, the earth no longer remains earth. If the will of God as it has been done in the sober, be so done in the intemperate, the intemperate will be sober, or if the will of God, as it has been done in the righteous, be so done in the unrighteous, the unrighteous will be righteous. Therefore if as the will of God has been done in heaven, so it is done on earth, we shall all be heaven. . . .

(Origen's interpretations may be thus summarised :—

1. Obvious—done by us on earth, as by the household of heaven.

1. (a) Possibly 'as in heaven so on earth' may go with all three clauses.

2. But how is this to be reconciled with Eph. vi. 12, 'spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places' ?

3. Possibly 'heaven' means Christ, and 'earth' the Church. We pray that we may do the Father's will as Christ did it.

4. How does Matt. xxviii. 18 fit in ? He has already authority in heaven, and has received it also on earth. This may, however, be spoken by Christ's humanity.

5. Meeting difficulty of Eph. vi. 12. As men though living on earth may belong to heaven, so these hosts belong not really to heaven, but to earth.

6. Heaven and earth may not be local here. A sinner is earth; he who does the will of God is heaven. We pray that God's will may be done by sinners as it has been by the righteous.)

**Origen**, Isaiah, Hom. i. 2, p. 107. The whole earth is not yet full of God's glory, but it will be filled when the prayer is fulfilled which the Lord taught us to pray to the Father. The will of the Father is still in heaven . . . not yet accomplished on earth.

**Romans**, Book VII. 6, p. 602. Those should be warned who ask of God prosperity for themselves in this present life, and health, or riches or honours; because they do not know how far what they ask is profitable. It often happens that these present gains and worldly dignity turn out to the loss of the soul or its eternal reproach. So we must hold the more to what the Lord taught us to say in prayer 'Thy will be done'.

**Tertullian**, Prayer, iv. (Before 'Thy Kingdom come'.) Not that any one stands in the way of God's will being done, and that we pray to Him for the success of His will; but we ask that His will may be done in all. According to the figurative interpretation of flesh and spirit, we are 'heaven' and 'earth' (i.e. 'heaven' = spirit, 'earth' = flesh). Even if it is understood literally, the meaning of the petition is the same, that the will of God may be done in us in earth, as it may be able to be done also in heaven.

Now what else does God will, than for us to walk according to His teaching? We ask therefore that He will supply us with the substance of His will and ability for it, that we may be saved both in heaven and in earth,



because the chief point of His will is the salvation of those whom He has adopted. There is also that will of God which the Lord carried out by preaching, working and enduring. For if He declared that He was doing not His own but the Father's will, the things which He was doing were without doubt the Father's will ; to these things as patterns we are now summoned that we may both preach and work and endure even to death. That we may be able to accomplish these things, we need the will of God. Again in saying ' Thy will be done ', we wish well to ourselves, because there is nothing evil in the will of God, even though ' something (evil) is inflicted according to each man's deserving. Already by this saying we forewarn ourselves of suffering. The Lord also when under the imminence of His Passion He had sought to show in His flesh the weakness of the flesh said ' Father, remove this cup ; ' and recollecting added ' not that my will, but Thine be done.' He Himself was the will and power of the Father ; and yet to display the patience which was due, He delivered Himself to the will of the Father.

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer, xiv (11). Not that God may do what He wills, but that we may be able to do what God wills. For who opposes God from doing whatever He wills ? But because the devil opposes our mind and action obeying God in all things, we pray and ask that the will of God may be done in us. That it may be done in us, we need God's will, that is, His help and protection ; because no one is strong in his own strength, but is safe by the favour and mercy of God. In short, even the Lord displaying the weakness of the humanity which He was wearing, says ' Father, if it can be done, let this cup pass from Me ' ; and, affording an example to His disciples that they should not do their own will

but God's, added, 'yet not what I will, but what Thou wilt'. And in another place He says 'I came not down from Heaven to do My own will, but the will of Him who sent Me.' But if the Son was obedient to do His Father's will, how much more ought the servant to obey to do his master's will! as John also in his epistle exhorts and teaches to do God's will (1 John ii. 15-17. Cyprian ends the quotation 'as God also abides for ever'). We who want to abide for ever, ought to do the will of God who is for ever.

Now God's will is that which Christ both did and taught. Humility in conduct, steadfastness in faith, modesty in words, righteousness in deeds, mercy in dealings, discipline in habits, not to know how to do a wrong and to be able to bear one when done to oneself; to keep peace with the brethren, to love (*diligere*) God with the whole heart, to love (*amare*) in Him that He is Father, to fear that He is God, to prefer nothing whatever to Christ, because He preferred nothing to us, to cleave inseparably to His love, to stand bravely and confidently by His Cross when there is a contest about His Name and honour, to show in speech the constancy whereby we confess Him, in trial the confidence with which we meet the attack, in death the patience by which we are crowned. This is to want to be a co-heir of Christ, this is to do the command of God, this is to fulfil the will of the Father.

We ask also for God's will to be done in heaven and in earth, both of which belong to the completion of our preservation and salvation. For since we possess the body from earth and the spirit from heaven, we ourselves are earth and heaven, and we pray that in both—in body and in spirit—God's will may be done. For there is between the flesh and the spirit a struggle, a daily

conflict as they fight one with another that we may not do those things which we wish, while the spirit seeks heavenly and divine things, the flesh covets earthly and temporal ones. Therefore we ask that by the help and aid of God harmony may be brought about between the two, that while the will of God is being carried on both in spirit and in flesh, the soul which has been born again through Him may be preserved. Cp. Gal. v. 17-22. Therefore we ask with daily—nay, with unceasing—prayers that both in heaven and in earth the will of God may be done concerning us ; because this is the will of God, that earthly things shall yield to heavenly, spiritual and divine things should prevail.

It may also be meant . . . that as the Lord exhorts us to love our enemies and pray for them that persecute us, so we should pray also for them who are still earth and have not yet begun to be of heaven ; that concerning them also the will of God may be done, which Christ carried out by preserving and restoring man. For since His disciples are called by Him no longer 'earth' but 'the salt of the earth'—and the apostle calls the first man 'from the clay of the earth', but the second 'from heaven' ; rightly we also, who ought to be like God the Father who makes His sun to rise on good and evil, and rains on just and unjust, so pray and ask at the monition of Christ, as to make request for the salvation of all men ; that as in heaven, that is in us, God's will has been done by our faith, that we might be of heaven, so also on earth, that is in them on their believing, God's will may be done ; that those who are by their first birth still of earth may begin to be of heaven, born of water and spirit.

Mortality, xviii. 'We ought not to do our own will, but God's, according as the Lord has bidden us pray daily.'

**Didascalia, 11.** What He has taught us to say when we pray, 'Thy will be done on earth, as in heaven,' is that as the angels of heaven and His hosts and all His servants praise God, so also on earth all men are to praise God. His will is to save every one.

v. 11. **Origen, Prayer, xxvii** gives the different phrases of Matthew and Luke, and continues, 'Since some suppose us to be told to pray for material bread . . . we must say in reply, How does He who says that we ought to ask for great and heavenly things, as if in forgetfulness of His own teaching command us to offer supplication to the Father for small and earthly things?' The bread which is digested into our flesh is no heavenly thing, nor is to ask for this any great request.

We follow His own teaching about bread in John vi. 26-33. (Origen gives short running commentary.) The true Bread is He who nourishes the true man, Who is made in the image of God, by which he who is nourished becomes also 'after the likeness of his Creator.' But what is more nourishing to the soul than the Word<sup>1</sup> or what is more precious to the mind of him who holds it than the Wisdom of God? What is more akin to the rational nature than the Truth?

If any object that He would not teach to ask for bread as though for something other than Himself, compare John vi. 32, 35, 51; where He speaks as of something other than Himself, while indeed He is the Bread.

But since all food is called in Scripture 'Bread'—e.g. Deut. ix. 9, and the Word that nourishes is manifold and various, since all men are not able to be nourished by the solidity and precision<sup>2</sup> of the divine teaching; therefore wishing to afford food suitable for the training

<sup>1</sup> Λόγος.

<sup>2</sup> εὐτρονία.



of the more perfect, He continues John vi. 51, 55, 57, 58. Now this is the 'true Food'—the flesh of Christ, who being Word has been made flesh (John i. 14). But whensoever we eat and drink Him, He has tabernacled in us ; when He is digested,<sup>1</sup> then is fulfilled the saying 'we beheld His glory.'

Cp. Paul writing to the Corinthians—1 Cor. iii. 1-3, and to the Hebrews, v. 12-14. So I think Rom. xiv. 2 is spoken not of material food but of the words of God which nourish the soul. Cp. also Solomon, Prov. xv. 17. . . . Therefore, that we may not be sick in our soul by lack of food, nor die to God by reason of 'famine of the words of the Lord,' let us in obedience to our Saviour ask the Father for the living Bread, which is the same as the *ἐπιούσιος*. The word *ἐπιούσιος* is not found in Greek, either among scholars, or in the current speech of ordinary people ; but appears to have been coined by the evangelists, for Matthew and Luke agree in having it. Translators from the Hebrew have done the same in other cases ; what Greek ever used *ἐνωτίζου* and *ἀκουτίσθητι* ? *ἐπιούσιος* resembles the phrase in Moses 'ye shall be to me *λαὸς περιούσιος* ('a peculiar people'). Both phrases seem connected with *οὐσία* 'real being,' the one pointing out the bread which contributes to real being, the other signifying a people engaged in real being and sharing in it. . . .

As the material bread digested into the body of him who is fed by it contributes to his real being, so the Living Bread that has come down from heaven, digested into the mind and soul, imparts its own powers to him who has set himself to receive nourishment from it. So the bread for which we ask will be *ἐπιούσιος*. As

<sup>1</sup> *ἀναδιδῶται*.

he who is fed reaches strength differing according to the quality of the food, whether it is solid and suitable for athletes, or consists of milk and herbs; so the Word of God being suitably given as milk to children, herbs to the weak, flesh to them who struggle, each of those who are fed can become such or such according to the degree in which he has entrusted himself to the Word. . . . *ἐπιούσιος* Bread is what is most correspondent to the rational nature, and akin to real being itself, according both health and vigour and strength to the soul, and imparting of its own immortality—(for the Word of God is immortal)—to him who eats it. (The *ἐπιούσιος* Bread seems the same as the Tree of Life or the Wisdom of God, Rev. iii. 18; Prov. iii. 18. So angels are fed by the Wisdom of God—not by material bread—cp. also the appearance to Abraham, Gen. xviii.)

He who partakes of the *ἐπιούσιος* bread, being strengthened in his heart, becomes son of God. . . . But it may be said that it is called *ἐπιούσιος* from *ἐπιέναι* ('come on'), so that we are bidden to ask for the proper <sup>1</sup> bread of the world to come, that God may give it us by anticipation, giving us to-day what is to-morrow's—the next age. But I prefer the former explanation. Matthew has 'to-day,' Luke 'day by day.' There are many Scripture examples of 'to-day' being used of the present time, this whole age, e.g. 'unto this day.' So 'yesterday' means the past age; cp. Ps. xciv. (v) 8; Heb. xiii. 8. . . .

But how can Christ have appeared at the consummation of the ages—Heb. ix. 26, if ages are to come on after this? How again can this be reconciled with Eph. ii. 7, 'the ages that are coming on'? But as the

<sup>1</sup> οἰκεῖον.

last month is the consummation of the year, though another month begins after this, so the present age may be the consummation of a number of ages, with yet other ages to follow. . . .

A thoughtful man will do his best in order that having become, by preparation here, worthy of obtaining the ἐπιούσιος Bread, he may receive it 'to-day' and 'day by day.' He who prays to God Who is infinite, not only about 'to-day' but also about what is 'day by day,' will be able to receive from Him who is able to bestow exceedingly abundantly above all that we ask or think.

'Our . . . Bread.' All things are the saints'; 1 Cor. iii. 22.

Psalms, Fragment in Gallandi on Ps. lxxvii (viii). 'He gave them bread from Heaven.' This is spiritual food. No man, wearing the image of the earthy, can eat heavenly bread, because 'the natural man receives not the things of the Spirit.' Concerning this food thou wast taught to pray. I eat the ἐπιούσιος bread which passes not forth and is not separated, but is digested into the real being (essence) of the soul, when I consider about God, about Christ, about His Deity, about His dwelling in human body and soul.

Luke (Fragment in Gallandi and Corderius). Necessarily 'day by day' is added. For our true life is, so to speak, one of renewal,<sup>1</sup> that the inner man may live according to God.

**Tertullian**, Prayer vi. The order of the Prayer has been finely drawn up by the divine wisdom. After heavenly things—the name of God, the will of God, the kingdom of God—it makes room for petitions also for earthly needs. For the Lord also had laid down 'Seek

<sup>1</sup> ἐπισκευαστή.

first the kingdom, and then these things also shall be added to you,' Matt. vi. 33. Although we should rather understand spiritually 'Give us to-day our daily bread.' For Christ is our Bread, because Christ is Life and the Bread of Life. He said, 'I am the Bread of Life,' and a little before 'Bread is the word<sup>1</sup> of the living God which came down from heaven' (John vi. 32, 33). Then because also His Body is recognized<sup>2</sup> in bread, 'This is My Body.' So by seeking daily bread we ask for continuance in Christ and inseparableness from His Body. But because (or, 'in so far as') the word may be taken materially, it cannot be used without the religious restraint of spiritual discipline. For He bids us ask for *bread* which is necessary only for believers; for the nations ask for all other things. This also He implies by examples and repeats by parables, saying 'Does a father take *bread* from his children and give it to dogs?' 'Does a father give a stone to his son who asks for bread?' For He shows what it is that sons expect from their father. So also the man who knocked by night was asking for bread. But He rightly added, 'Give us to-day,' seeing He had prefixed 'Take no thought of the morrow, what ye shall eat.' To which point also He applied the parable of the man who, when all his fruits turned out well, thought of enlarging barns and periods of long peace, but himself died that night.

Fasting, xv. Christ bade that in our regular prayer bread was to be asked for, not also the riches of Attalus!

Cyprian, Lord's Prayer, xviii. This petition can be understood both spiritually and simply, since either sense is by divine help profitable for salvation. The

<sup>1</sup> Sermo.

<sup>2</sup> Censetur.



Bread of Life is Christ ; He is the Bread, not of all men, but of us. As we say 'Our Father,' because He is Father of those who understand and believe, so we say 'our bread,' because Christ is the Bread of those who handle <sup>1</sup> His Body. But this Bread we ask to be given to us daily, lest we who are in Christ and receive the Eucharist daily as food of salvation, should by the intervention of some serious offence, while cut off and not communicating we are forbidden the heavenly bread, be separated from the Body of Christ, while He Himself proclaims and exhorts, John vi. 51. . . . As it is clear that those live who touch His Body and receive the Eucharist in right of communicating, so on the other hand we must fear and pray lest while any is cut off and separated from the Body of Christ, he may remain far from salvation ; since Christ Himself warns us saying 'Unless ye eat the flesh . . . ye have no life in you.' And therefore we ask that our Bread, that is Christ, should be given us daily, that we who abide and live in Christ may not depart from His sanctification and His Body.

It may also mean that we who have renounced the world and cast away its riches and pomps by faith in spiritual grace, may seek only food and livelihood for ourselves, since the Lord instructs us saying 'He who renounces not all that he has, cannot be My disciple.' Now he who has begun to be a disciple of Christ, renouncing all things according to his Master's word, ought to ask for daily food, and not to extend at length the desires of his petition, as the Lord Himself again prescribes, saying 'Think not for the morrow, for the morrow shall think for itself, sufficient for the day is its

<sup>1</sup> Contingunt.

own evil.' Rightly then does the disciple of Christ ask livelihood for himself for the day, being forbidden to think for the morrow, because it is self-contradiction for us to seek to live long in the world, who ask for the Kingdom of God to come speedily. Cp. also the blessed apostle, 1 Tim. vi. 7-10. Cp. also the history of the Rich Fool, Luke xii who was rejoicing over his fruits while about to die that very night, and was thinking over abundance of livelihood, while life was already failing him; on the other hand the Lord teaches that he is perfect and complete, who lays up treasure for himself in heaven, after selling all his goods and distributing them to the use of the poor. He says that *he* can follow Him and copy the glory of the Lord's Passion, who is unhindered, girt up and entangled by no snares of property, but being loosed and free sends on his riches to God and himself follows them. That each may be able to prepare himself for this, let him learn so to pray and to know from the standard of the prayer what his character ought to be.

Daily food cannot fail the righteous: Prov. x. 3; Ps. xxxvii. 25; Matt. vi. 31-3. He promises to bestow all things on those who seek the kingdom and righteousness of God. For since all things are God's nothing will fail him who has God, if he himself does not fail God. Cp. Daniel in the lion's den (Bel 37-9), and Elijah fed by ravens.

Eusebius, on Ps. xxxvi (xxxvii) 16. The righteous man who is poor, is content with little, being taught in prayer to say 'Give us. . . .' Much better is the righteous man who receives the daily <sup>1</sup> bread from God, than the wealth of sinners. He who is content with a

<sup>1</sup> ἐφ' ἡμέρον.

little has the Lord supporting his soul and life, sufficing him beyond all wealth.

On Ps. liv (lv) 22, Eusebius explains ἐπιούσιος as rational <sup>1</sup> and heavenly food.

v. 12. Irenæus, V. xvii. 1, p. 313. The Lord taught us to say in prayer 'And forgive us our debts,' addressed to our Father, whose debtors we were, having transgressed His commandment.

Clement, Strom. VII. xiii. 81, 1. The true Gnostic never remembers those who have sinned against him, but forgives. Wherefore also he rightly prays 'Forgive us'—saying 'For we also forgive.'

Origen, Prayer xxviii. f, p. 252f. (Cp. Luke xi. 4.)

On debts, the Apostle says 'Render to all their dues <sup>2</sup>—owe no man anything except loving one another.' Therefore we 'owe' by having any things which are appropriate, not only in the matter of giving, but in kindly words, actions, disposition. Owing these things, we either pay them by performing what is assigned us by the divine law, or not heeding them, by disregarding the sound word, we continue in debt. (We owe various debts to all; to our brethren, spiritual or natural; to our townsmen, and to all men. . . .) He who does not perform what is due to brethren remains a debtor for what he has not done. So also if we fail even to men in any things suggested to us by the kindly <sup>3</sup> Spirit of wisdom, the debt becomes greater. But also in things regarding ourselves, we ought to use our body as is right, not to consume its flesh by self-indulgence; and we ought also to show this care for our soul, and to provide for the keenness of the mind and reason, that it may be keen and useful and in no wise idle. Whenever

<sup>1</sup> λογικός.

<sup>2</sup> ὀφειλάς.

<sup>3</sup> φιλανθρώπου.

we do not do these things we owe to ourselves our debt becomes heavier. So we ought to preserve a certain disposition towards God—love to Him from our whole heart—strength—and mind. If we do not perform these things, we remain debtors to God, sinning against the Lord ; who will pray for us after this ? (1 Sam. ii. 25.)

But we are also debtors to Christ who bought us with His Blood, just as every slave is debtor to his purchaser, so much money having been given for him. We have a due also to the Holy Spirit, which is rendered when we do not grieve Him in whom we have been sealed unto the day of redemption ; not grieving Him we bear the fruits which we are asked for, He being with us and quickening our soul. (So we are debtors also to our angel, who sees the face of our Father in Heaven.) And if we are in a theatre of the world and angels and men (1 Cor. iv. 9) we must know that as the man in a theatre is a debtor (bound) to say or do this or that in the sight of the spectators, and any one not so doing is punished for having insulted the whole theatre ; so also we owe to the whole world and to all angels and to all mankind those things which we shall learn from wisdom if we will.

(There are special things *due* from a *widow* for whom the Church provides ; from a *deacon*, from a *presbyter*.)

A bishop's due is the heaviest, required by the Saviour of the whole Church, and avenged if not paid. (Also there are mutual dues of husband and wife, 1 Cor. vii. 3.)

All can reason out for themselves how much we owe and shall be constrained if not paying, but freed if we pay. It is not possible for any living man to escape a debt every hour of day or night.

We either pay what is due or keep it back wrongfully.



Some owe no man anything ; some pay most but owe a little ; some pay a little and owe more ; perhaps there is some one who pays nothing and owes all. Yet he who pays everything, so as to owe nothing, sets this right just at the time, yet needs remission of his past debts ; which remission he can reasonably attain, who has for some time arrived at being one who owes nothing as not paid when falling due. But these lawless actions stamped on the mind, become the bond against us from which we shall be judged, like books which are to be brought by all those so to speak under bond, when we shall all stand before the tribunal of Christ that (2 Cor. v. 10). Of this debt is it said in Prov. xxii. 26-7.

If we owe to so many, certainly some owe to us ; as men—or as townsmen—as fathers—as sons—as wives to husbands or friends to friends. Since then out of our very many debtors some conduct themselves more slackly in paying what is due to us, we shall act more kindly in not bearing a grudge against them, and recollecting our own debts which we have often neglected, not only with regard to men, but with regard to God Himself. For recollecting what things we have owed, but have not paid but kept back, letting the time slip by when we ought to have done such and such things for our neighbours, we shall be gentler <sup>1</sup> to those who owe to us and have not paid ; especially if we do not forget our own transgressions against what is divine and our iniquities against heaven—either by ignorance of the truth or by displeasure at events befalling us.

But if we will not be gentler to those who have incurred debt against us, we shall suffer the fate of him who did not forgive his fellow servant the 'hundred'

<sup>1</sup> *πρᾶότεροι.*

pence'—(Matt. xviii. 23–35). We must forgive those who have sinned against us, on their saying that they repent, even if our debtor does so often, Luke xvii. 3–4. But we are not hard to those who do not repent; but they are evil to themselves. 'He that rejecteth discipline hateth himself', Prov. xvi. 1 (xv. 32).

Luke having said 'Forgive us our *sins*'—for sins arise when we owe and do not pay—agrees with Matthew, who does not mean to allow place for one who would forgive debtors only on condition of repentance, saying that it has been laid down by the Lord, that we ought to add in the prayer 'For we also forgive every one who is indebted to us.' Yet we all have authority to forgive sins committed against us; this is clear from (this clause in both versions of the Lord's Prayer). But he who is inspired by Jesus like the Apostles, and can be known by his fruits to have received the Holy Spirit and to have become spiritual by being led by the Spirit as a son of God to each of the things which are to be done according to reason, forgives whatever God forgives, and retains those sins which are incurable. [See on John xx. 19. . .]

Romans, Book IV. 1, p. 522. You will often find sins called in the divine volumes 'debts'—as the Lord Himself taught us to say in prayer 'Forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors'; and (in the parable of the Two Debtors) when He Himself interprets 'debts' as sins.

Tertullian, Prayer, vii. Naturally after noticing God's bounty we pray also for His mercy. For what will nourishments profit us, if we are consigned to them as an ox for the slaughter? The Lord knew that He Himself alone was without fault. He teaches therefore us to ask that our debts be remitted. Asking for pardon

is confession,<sup>1</sup> for he who asks for pardon confesses his fault. So penitence is shown to be acceptable to God, because He wills it rather than the death of a sinner. Now 'debt' is in Scripture a figure for 'offence' (delictum), because it is equally liable to judgment and is exacted by it; nor does it escape the judgment of the exaction, unless the exaction be remitted, as the Lord remitted the debt to that servant; for this is the point of the whole parable. (The treatment of the Unforgiving Servant) corresponds with our profession that we also remit to our debtors. Cp. Matt. xviii. 21-2.

Chastity, ii. (This must not be so distorted as to render discipline lax and uncertain.)

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer, 22f. After support of food is sought also forgiveness of fault; that he who is fed from God may live in God; that regard may be paid not only to the present temporal life, but also to the eternal, which can be attained if sins are forgiven, which the Lord calls debts, saying in His Gospel 'I forgave thee all thy debt because thou besoughtest me'. But how needfully, how thoughtfully and savingly we are warned that we are sinners, obliged to entreat for our sins; that while pardon is sought from God, the mind should recollect its own consciousness. That no one may be pleased with himself as innocent, and by exalting himself may perish the more, he is instructed and taught that he sins daily, while he is bidden to pray daily for his sins. So in short, John warns us in his Epistle—1 John i. 8-9—embracing both, that we ought to pray for our sins and that we win pardon when we pray. So he called the Lord also faithful to forgive sins, keeping

<sup>1</sup> Exomologesis.

faith in His promise ; because He who taught us to pray for our debts and sins has promised that the Father's mercy and pardon would follow.

He added also a law, binding us by a certain condition and pledge, that we should ask for our debts to be so forgiven according as we also forgive our debtors ; knowing that we cannot obtain what we are seeking for our sins unless we ourselves have done the like towards our debtors. So elsewhere He says ' With what measure ye have measured, with it shall it be measured again to you.' And the servant who after the whole debt had been forgiven him by his master would not himself forgive his fellow servant is bound in prison. Since he would not pardon his fellow servant, he lost the pardon granted him by his master. Christ sets this forth yet more strongly in His commandments, with fuller emphasis of His reproof (*censuræ*). Mark xi. 25. No excuse remains for you in the day of judgment when you will be judged according to your own verdict, and will suffer just what you have done. God commands those in His house to be peaceable and harmonious and of one mind ; and such as He has made us by our second birth, He wants the new born to continue, that we who have begun to be sons of God may remain in the peace of God, and that those who have one Spirit may have also one mind and thought (feeling, ' *sensus* '). Cp. Matt. v. 23-4. (Cyprian next compares the sacrifices of Cain and of Abel. God regarded not their gifts, but their hearts. Abel was fitly the first martyr. But the sin of discord and hatred cannot be washed away even by martyrdom. 1 John iii. 15.)

v. 13. Luke xi. 4. Origen, *Prayer*, xxixf. p. 256, notices that Luke omits the second clause. If the Saviour does not enjoin us to pray for impossibilities, it



seems worth examination how it is that we are commanded to pray not to enter into temptation, since the whole of man's life on earth is a scene of temptation.<sup>1</sup> For being on earth surrounded by the flesh which wars against the spirit, whose mind is enmity against God, and which can by no means be subject to the Law of God, we are in temptation. That the whole of human life is with us a scene of temptation, we have learnt from Job vii. 1 ; Ps. xvii. 30, LXX (xviii. 29).

So also Paul writes to the Corinthians that God bestows not freedom from temptation but freedom from being tempted beyond our power (1 Cor. x. 13). For whether our wrestling is with the flesh which lusts and wars against the spirit, or with the soul of all flesh, which is of the same name as the body in which the ruling principle dwells, which is called the heart, as is the wrestling of the tempted with human temptation ; or whether as more advanced and perfect athletes, wrestling no longer against flesh and blood, nor tested in human temptations which have now been trodden under foot, we have our struggles with the principalities, the powers, the world rulers of this darkness, and the spiritual hosts of wickedness—we are never clear from being tempted.

How then does the Saviour bid us ' pray not to enter into temptation ', since God tempts all in some way ? The words of Judith (viii. 26–7), were not only for the elders of her time, but for all who read her book. Cp. also Ps. xxxiii (xxxiv) 20 ; Acts xiv. 22.

If we, like most people, fail to understand the meaning of prayer not to enter into temptation, there is occasion to say that the prayer of the Apostles was not heard, since

<sup>1</sup> *πειρατήριον*.

they suffered innumerable things throughout their life. 2 Cor. xi. 23f; cp. also iv. 8-9. But if the Apostles have not succeeded in this prayer, what hope has any of their inferiors of finding God hearken to his prayer?

Any of those who do not carefully examine the meaning of the Saviour's injunction, might reasonably suppose Ps. xxv (xxvi) 2, 'examine me, O Lord, and prove me; try my reins and my heart,' to be contrary to our Lord's teaching on prayer. But when have men ever been supposed to be outside of temptation? . . . and what time is there in which one has disregarded the need of struggling against likelihood of sinning? (Poverty has its temptations, cp. Prov. xxx. 9; xiii. 8; so has wealth, even spiritual wealth—as in the case of Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 7.) How many who have not made a right use of material wealth have received in punishment a place along with the rich man in the Gospel?—and how many bearing poverty dishonourably, living more slavishly and basely than befits saints, have fallen from heavenly hope? Nor are those between poverty and wealth at all clear of sinning. (There are temptations of health and vigour, to 'corrupt the temple of God'. So also in sickness, when one has leisure for thoughts of unclean things.) Many, overcome by labours and not knowing how to bear sickness manfully, have been convicted of being diseased in their soul rather than in their bodies. Many also have, because of shunning dishonour, being ashamed to bear nobly the name of Christ, fallen into eternal shame.

A man may think he is safe from temptation when honoured among men. But the saying is severe 'They have received their reward from men'—addressed to those who were uplifted by glory with the multitude as though a good thing. So also John v. 44.

Why must I recount the falls, through pride, of those regarded as noble, and the fawning subservience shown by those called ignoble, to those who are regarded as superiors? This marks them off as having no genuine affection for God, while merely feigning love to men.

So the whole life of man on earth is a sphere of temptation; so we pray to be delivered from this sphere, not by not being tempted, which is impossible, at all events for 'those on earth'; but by not being worsted by temptation. It is he who is worsted by temptation who *enters into temptation*—entangled in its nets. But I will add this also, to show that every occasion is one of temptation to man; not even he who meditates on the Law of God day and night, and strives to accomplish the saying 'The mouth of the righteous will meditate wisdom' is clear from being tempted. (There is risk of perversion of sense of Scripture and addiction to impious or foolish doctrines. He who does not hold the truth about God or His Christ has fallen away from the true God and His Only-begotten.)

We ought then to pray, not that we may not be tempted, but that we may not be enveloped by the temptation, as they fare who are entangled in it and conquered. Outside the Prayer it is written 'not to enter into temptation'—which may be clear from what has been said; but in the Prayer we say 'Bring us not into temptation'. How are we to understand that God brings into the temptation the man who has not prayed or who is not heard? For it is unsuitable, since he who is overcome enters into the temptation, to suppose that God leads any one into temptation, as if giving him up to be overcome. The same incongruity awaits *any* interpretation of 'Pray that ye enter not into

temptation.' For if it is evil to fall into temptation, which we pray may not be our case, is it not strange to suppose that the good God, Who cannot bear evil fruits, envelops any one in evil things?

Cp. Rom. i. 22f. . .

I hold that God deals with each rational soul with a view to its everlasting life; it has always free-will and by its own determination either rises to the height of good or sinks into the flood of evil. Too speedy a cure makes some people make light of their diseases, as easily curable, so that they fall into the same a second time. God therefore acts reasonably in allowing wickedness to increase; so that men having been satisfied with the sin they desire may realize the harm, hate what they previously welcomed, and so being cured more surely may enjoy the health of their souls. Cp. Num. xi. 4-6, 10, 18-20. This narrative serves to remove the incongruity which appears in 'Bring us not into temptation' and in the words of the Apostle. So long as the people had not what they desired, they could not cease from their craving;<sup>1</sup> but the kind and good God, giving them what they desired, resolved to give it in such a way as to leave no more desire in them. Intending to make it pall upon them, He really threatens rather than promises. . . (The case in Romans i is similar. They will be purged by punishment.) So also with the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. He needs further hardening and suffering, lest if his hardening cease too soon, he might despise it and so become much more deserving to be hardened. . . . If God with reason brings into the snare, according to Ps. lxv (lxvi) 11, and without the counsel of the Father not even the sparrow,

<sup>1</sup> πάθος.



cheapest of the winged fowls, falls into the snare (that which falls into the snare falling into it just because it did not rightly use the power of its wings given to bear it up), let us pray that we do nothing which deserves being brought, by the righteous judgment of God, into temptation (into which all are brought who act according to Rom. i. 24, 26, 28).

The profit of being tempted is something of this kind. The things which our soul has received unknown to all except God, yea even to ourselves, become manifest through temptations, in order that our character may no longer be hidden, and that recognizing ourselves we may, if we wish, be conscious of our own faults, and may give thanks for the good things manifest to us through temptations. But that the temptations which arise come for the sake of displaying our character or for the recognition of the secrets of our heart, is established by Job xl. 3, and Deut. viii. 2f.

(Origen considers the cases of Eve, Cain, Ham, Esau, Joseph. The temptation simply revealed the weakness or strength of character.)

Let us prepare ourselves to meet all that may happen. What is lacking by reason of human weakness, God will accomplish, if we do all that lies in our power.

Luke seems to have regarded 'Deliver us from the evil one' as virtually taught in 'Bring us not into temptation'. It is likely that the Lord addressed the more concise form to the disciple, as one who had already received help, but the clearer form to the larger number needing plainer teaching. God delivers us from the evil one, not when the enemy in no wise approaches us, wrestling against us through any of his crafts and the ministers of his will, but when we overcome by manfully standing against what befalls us. So we have

understood also the words 'Many are the afflictions of the righteous and He will deliver them out of them all.' God delivers from affliction, not by their no longer coming—cp. 2 Cor. iv. 8, but when though afflicted we are by the help of God not straitened; 'to be afflicted'<sup>1</sup> signifying according to traditional use among the Hebrews, some crisis occurring involuntarily, but 'to be straitened'<sup>2</sup> applying to what is voluntary, overcome by the affliction and giving way to it. Whence Paul well says 'In everything afflicted but not straitened', cp. also Ps. iv. 2 (1). By the co-operation and presence of the Word of God who encourages and saves us, the cheerfulness and courage of our mind which comes from God in a critical time is named 'enlargement'.

In like manner we must understand deliverance of any from the evil one. God delivered Job; not by the devil not having received power to surround him with these temptations, but by him in no wise sinning before the Lord amidst all the things which befell him; by his being displayed to be righteous, while the adversary was put to shame as having belied him (i. 11–21; ii. 4–5, 9–10). Job having wrestled two wrestlings and overcome, does not encounter a third contest of such importance; the third wrestling was reserved for the Saviour, as recorded in the three Gospels.

That we may with understanding ask of God not to enter into temptation and to be delivered from the evil one . . . let us beseech that when tempted we may not be slain, and when struck by the fiery darts of the evil one may not be kindled by them. All they are kindled by them whose hearts have become 'as an oven' (Hos. vii. 6); but they are not kindled, who by the shield of

<sup>1</sup> θλίβεσθαι.

<sup>2</sup> στενοχωρεῖσθαι.

faith quench all the fiery darts sent upon them by the evil one, since they have in themselves 'rivers of water springing up to eternal life' which do not allow the power of the evil one to prevail, but easily destroy it by the flood of divine and saving thoughts, impressed by insight into the truth upon the soul of him who is training to be spiritual.

Origen thus takes τοῦ πονηροῦ as masculine, 'the evil one'. So on Ps. xxxvi (xxxvii); Hom. ii. 4, p. 661. The Lord in the Gospel did not call the devil simply a sinner, but the Evil one, and when He teaches in prayer He says 'But deliver us from the evil one'—so Matt. 28, 'an evil man hath done this.'

So Hippolytus, Heads against Gaius, vii. Gaius, on the ground of Matt. xii. 29, held that Satan was already bound, as against Apoc. xx. 2-3. Hippolytus answers (inter alia) 'If this were so, how will the Lord have taught us to pray that we may be delivered from the evil one?'

So Clementine Homilies, xix. 2, the words are quoted as a proof of the existence of a prince of evil.

Tertullian, Prayer, viii. He added, to make so brief a prayer a complete one, that we should supplicate not only for forgiveness of sins but for avoidance of them altogether. 'Lead us not into temptation,' i.e. 'let us not be led into it,' viz. by the tempter. Away with the thought that the Lord should be thought to tempt, as if He either did not know the faith of any one or longed to overthrow it. Weakness and malice are of the devil. God had bidden Abraham to sacrifice his son, not for the sake of tempting his faith but of approving it, that through him He might add an example to the commandment He was soon about to give, that none should hold

his loved ones <sup>1</sup> dearer than God. He Himself when tempted by the devil displayed who it is that presides over temptation and contrives it. This position He establishes by later sayings, 'Pray that ye be not tempted.' They were tempted in deserting the Lord, because they had given themselves to sleep rather than to prayer. So the last clause corresponds, interpreting the meaning of 'Lead us not into temptation;' that is 'But withdraw us from the evil one.'

Flight in Persecution, ii. But in our regular <sup>2</sup> prayer when we say to the Father 'lead us not into temptation'—and what greater temptation is there than persecution?—we acknowledge that it comes from him from whom we seek relief; for this is what follows 'But deliver us from the evil one,' i.e. bring us not into temptation by delivering us to the evil one. For then are we delivered from the devil's hands, when we are not delivered to him for temptation.

Cyprian, Lord's Prayer, xxv. (19). 'Suffer us not to be led into temptation.' He shows that the adversary has no power against us, unless God have previously permitted; that all our fear, devotion and regard may be directed to God, since in our temptations nothing is permitted to the evil one, unless power be granted from God. Cp. Dan. i. 1-2, 'gave into his hand.' Now power against us is given to the evil one according to our sins, as is written, Isa. xlii. 24-5. So when Solomon sinned and departed from the commandments and ways of the Lord, it is stated 'And the Lord raised up Satan against Solomon himself,'—(1 Kings xi. 14, LXX. and O.L.). But power against us is given in two ways, (1) for punishment, when we offend; (2) for

<sup>1</sup> Pignora

<sup>2</sup> Legitima.



glory, when we are being approved as Job ; and the Lord says in His Gospel ' Thou wouldest have no power against me unless it were given thee from above.' But when we ask not to come into temptation, we are reminded of our weakness and instability, while we so ask, lest any one should lift himself up haughtily, lest any should claim anything for himself proudly and arrogantly, lest any should ascribe to himself the glory of confession or suffering ; since the Lord Himself teaching humility, said ' watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation ; the spirit indeed is ready, but the flesh is weak ; ' that, while humble and submissive confession precedes and all is ascribed to God, whatever is sought suppliantly with fear and honour of God may be bestowed by His kindness (*pietas*).

After all these things at the conclusion of the prayer comes a short clause summing all our petitions and prayers in concise brevity. For we set at the end ' But deliver us from (the) evil (one) '—including all the adverse things which the enemy contrives against us in this world, from which things there can be trustworthy and sure protection if God delivers us, if He afford His help to those who entreat and implore it. But when we say ' Deliver us from (the) evil (one), ' there remains nothing which ought to be asked for further when once we seek God's protection against evil. When this is granted we stand secure and safe against all things worked by the devil and the world. What fear of the world <sup>1</sup> has he whose protector in the world is God ?

**Dionysius** of Alexandria (on Luke xxii ; *Feltoe*, p. 247). This is ' Allow us not to fall into temptation.' But because this was not to escape temptation, but to be

<sup>1</sup> *Saeculum*

delivered from (the) evil (one), He added 'But deliver us from (the) evil (one).'

But perhaps you will say, What is the difference between being tempted and falling or entering into temptation? He who is worsted by the evil one,—and he will be worsted, unless he struggle and God shield him—has fallen into temptation and entered into temptation, and is in it and under it as one led captive; but he who resists and has endured, has indeed been tempted, but has not entered or fallen into temptation.

Jesus at all events was led up by the Spirit, not to enter into temptation, but to be tempted by the devil. And Abraham did not enter into temptation, nor did God lead him into temptation; He tempted him but did not cast him into temptation. And the Lord Himself tempted the disciples. For the evil one, when tempting, drags into temptation, as a tempter of evil things; but God when tempting, carries the temptation along, as being untempted of evil. James i. 13. For the devil presses us, dragging to destruction; but God training us to salvation <sup>1</sup> leads us by the hand.

**Origen**, Prayer, xviii considers the different occasions on which Matthew and Luke give the Lord's Prayer, and their differences of text.

**Tertullian**, Prayer ix brings out the inclusiveness of the Prayer. How many duties are discharged <sup>2</sup> at once—honour of God in the Father, testimony of faith in the Name, offering of obedience in the Will, commemoration of hope in the Kingdom, seeking for life in the Bread, confession of debts in deprecation, anxiousness of temptations in requesting protection. What marvel!

<sup>1</sup> ἀπειραστος or 'untempting with.'

<sup>2</sup> Expunguntur.

God alone could have taught how He would have Himself addressed in prayer.

(For the Lord's Prayer, see also Luke xi, § 89.)

*v.* 17. **Origen**, Leviticus, Hom. x. 2, pp. 245-6. (If you wish to fast according to Christ, and to afflict your soul, every time of the whole year is suitable.) Fast according to the law of the Gospel. For how to wash the face, read the Apostle's teaching, how with unveiled face you may behold the glory of the Lord, formed into the same image from glory to glory as from the Spirit of the Lord. 'Anoint thy head' but not with the oil of sin (Ps. cxlii. 5) but with the oil of gladness, the oil of joy, the oil of mercy, so that according to the command of wisdom, mercy and truth forsake thee not. . . . Fast from all sin; take no food of wickedness. . . . Fast from evil acts, abstain from evil words, keep thyself from evil thoughts. Take not stolen bread of perverted teaching. (Origen—or rather Rufinus—implies forty days fast of Lent, and those of Wednesday and Friday.)

**Eusebius**, on Isa. lviii. 5. If any one wants to be taught the manner of a true fast pleasing to God, let him do this. Making his countenance cheerful, and anointing his head with oil according to the Saviour's exhortation, let him keep the fast in secret and show the humiliation of his soul only to the Father who sees what is secret; but let him bring to light in the sight of all through his works the fruits of the godliness of his soul.

*vv.* 19-20. **Clement**, Strom. III. xii. 86, 3. Some misapply this to procreation of children, but the Saviour did not speak of this, but was exhorting those who were seeking simply to acquire abundance of wealth, and not to help those in need, to share with others.

IV. vi. 33, 3. The Lord spoke this, perhaps rebuking

those who love possessions, perhaps also those who are simply careful and anxious, and indeed all those who indulge their bodies ; for passions and desires and evil thoughts ' dig through ' <sup>1</sup> the reason and the whole man. But our real treasure is where is what is akin to the soul.

**Origen**, on Ps. xviii (xix) 1-2, p. 613. Those who accept the contemplative life lay up treasure in heaven, and having their heart there, are heavens declaring the glory of God. The active are the firmament.

**Jeremiah**, Hom. v. 13, p. 157. If we lay up treasure in heaven, we also have our heart in Jerusalem above : Gal. iv. 26.

xiv. 12, p. 215. Every man lays up treasure ; if he is worthless, on earth ; if he is noble, in heaven, as we are taught in the Gospel.

**Matthew**, Tome x. 14, p. 459. Not one single moth of the passions can touch his spiritual and heavenly riches, cp. Prov. ii. 7. Grief is a worm and a moth, injuring the heart which has not its treasure in heaven and spiritual places ; if any one treasure up there, he has his heart in heaven and says ' If a host should camp against me, my heart will not fear.' So neither can thieves, of whom the Saviour saith, ' All that came before Me are thieves and robbers,' break through the things treasured up in heaven, and the heart present with them.

**John**, Tome xix. 21, p. 303f. If any one lays up treasure on the earth, from the very fact of laying up treasure on the earth he comes of those beneath ; but if any one lays up treasure in heaven, he is born from above, and receives the image of the heavenly.

(See also on Luke xii 32f, § 95.)

<sup>1</sup> διορύσσουσιν.



*vv.* 22-3; Luke xi. 34-6. Clement, Paed. III. xi. 70, 4, p. 295, Potter. 'The eye,' through which inward things appear, illuminated (reflected) by the shining light.

Origen, Prov. xi (Frag. in Mai). Christ in the Gospel calls the soul 'body.' The 'lamp' is the mind, for it is receptive of knowledge; the 'body' is the passionate and craving part of the soul, which some call the irrational, others the affective <sup>1</sup> part.

Luke (Frag. in Gallandi and Corderius). I think the meaning is 'Since by reason of the body having become light, being enlightened by the lamp of the body, there is in thee no longer any part dark, if thou in no wise sinnest any more; so will the whole body be light so that its rays are comparable to a lamp with illuminating gleam which by its shining dissolves the darkness. For the enlightenment from the mind resembles the most brilliant gleam; and the light in the body which is naturally darkness but is carried whither the mind wills, resembles a gleaming lamp.'

Joshua, Hom. xvii. 3, p. 439. If you, a layman, neglect to support the priests and Levites, the light of knowledge in you will be darkened by your not supplying oil for the lamp. Then the Lord's words will be fulfilled in you, 'If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness.' So, that the light of knowledge may shine in the priests and their lamp may be ever kindled, do you fulfil your duty.

Gregory Thaumaturgus (Corderius and Gallandi). The single eye is love unfeigned, by which all the body is lighted, putting forth outwardly the same as is thought inwardly; the evil eye is feigned love, i.e. hypocrisy,

<sup>1</sup> παθητικόν.

through which all the body of the man is darkened. . . . If the love which appears to be light in thee is a work worthy of darkness because of the hypocrisy hidden in it, what then are thy manifest transgressions ?

The Apostles were appointed eyes and light of the world. The Lord Himself charges them—‘ If ye stand and turn not back, being the light of the body, behold all the body of the world is lighted. But if ye being salt lose your savour, and being light become darkness, how great is the darkness which is the world ! ’

**Eusebius**, on Ps. vi. 7 (vii). ‘ Eye ’ = mind, as in Matt. vi. 22. It is not possible that one of the two eyes should be the lamp of the body.

v. 24. **2 Clement vi.** The Lord saith ‘ No servant can serve two masters.’ If we want to serve both God and Mammon, it is inexpedient for us. For what is the profit if any gain the whole world but lose his soul ? This age and the age to come are two enemies. We cannot be friends of the two ; we must renounce the one and use the other.

**Irenæus**, III. viii. I, H. ; III. viii. 1, pp. 182–3, M. ‘ He does not call Mammon a master (Lord) by saying Ye cannot serve two masters ; ’ but teaches the disciples who are serving God not to be subject to Mammon or lorded over by him (it). For He says ‘ he who does sin is the servant of sin.’ As then He calls them who serve sin servants of sin, yet does not call sin itself God, so also He calls them who serve Mammon servants of Mammon, without calling Mammon God. Mammonas is according to the Jewish speech, which the Samaritans also use, ‘ greedy ’ (cupidus) and wanting to have more than one ought. But according to the Hebrew, it is called by an addition (adjunctive) Mamuel, and signifies ‘ gluttonous,’ that is, one who cannot keep from

gluttony. According to either of these meanings we cannot serve God and Mammon.

(It is difficult to work out Irenæus' derivation, and 'Mamuel' is probably corrupt. See Deane in loc.)

Clement, Strom. III. iv. 26, 2. Nicolas refused, according to the Saviour's command, to serve two masters, pleasure and God.

IV. vi. 30, 4. The Lord gives the name 'Mammon' to avarice.<sup>1</sup>

VII. xi. 71, 6. Not simply money<sup>2</sup> but the resources for pleasure of various kinds which money affords; it is not possible for one who has known God nobly and truly, to serve contrary pleasures.

Tertullian, Soul, xvi. The devil is here called the lord (Master) of his own order.

To his Wife, ii. 3. How can a Christian woman serve two masters, the Lord and her husband, and him a heathen?

Flight in Persecution, xii. (Against escape by bribery or paying blackmail.) If we cannot serve God and Mammon, can we be redeemed by God and by Mammon? For who will serve Mammon more than *he* does, whom Mammon has redeemed?

Cyprian, Lapsed, xxvii. But (the 'libellaticus') has served the worldly master, has observed his edict, has obeyed a human command rather than God.

Judgments of the Bishops, lxvi. Julianus of Marceliana said 'If a man can serve two masters, God and Mammon, baptism can also serve two, a Christian and a heretic.'

Origen, Against Celsus, viii. 2f, p. 745. Celsus says that Christians quote this verse against worshipping

<sup>1</sup> φιλαργυρία.

<sup>2</sup> τὸ ἀργύριον.

demons. He criticises this position as anthropomorphic; a man may be hurt by the service of another, but no hurt or pain can befall God; and these inferior gods all belong to the Supreme.

Origen, quoting the whole context, says that Holy Scripture knows that the great Lord is above all gods; viz. not those worshipped among the heathen, which are daemons, but those meant Ps. lxxxii (ii) 1; xlix. (i) 1. Christ is the 'Lord of Lords'. But we worship none of these; not as though God were being hurt as a man might be, but that we may not ourselves be hurt by separating ourselves from the portion of the Supreme God.

VIII. 56, p. 784. We cannot serve at the same time God and Mammon, whether this is called one or many. It is clear to us that as there are two laws in opposition one to another, the law of God and the law of Mammon, it is preferable for us to dishonour Mammon by transgressing Mammon's law, that by keeping God's law we may honour God, than vice versa.

Judges, Hom. ii. 3, p. 462. Mammon is avarice. . . They say that with the Syrians Mammon is the god of this passion.

Ps. xxxvi (xxxvii) 31. Hom. v. 6, p. 679. So no one can set his hope in two masters; in the uncertainty of riches and in the Lord; in princes and in God; in the strength of a horse, and in God; in the world and in God.

Jeremiah, Hom. xx. 7, p. 272. No one can be a friend to both God and Mammon, to Christ and to the serpent; but friendship with Christ must cause enmity to the serpent, and friendship with the serpent must beget enmity to Christ.

VII. 3, p. 168. Do you honour money as a great good, and the wealth which is below? Mammon is your



God and Lord, for Jesus called it the Lord (Master) of the covetous.

Romans, Book VI. 3, p. 572. No one can at once serve two masters, sin and righteousness; for either he will hate the one, viz. sin, and love the other, viz. righteousness; or will suffer (*patietur*) the one, viz. sin, and despise the other, viz. righteousness.

Adamantius, i. 28, p. 820. Megethius explains 'no man can serve two masters' by Matt. vii. 18, the two masters corresponding to the two natures. Adamantius asks why he has not quoted the context, but only what suits his purpose; he quotes the whole verse. Eutropius (the judge) asks the meaning of 'Mammon'? Adamantius replies 'Money'.<sup>1</sup>

Clementine Recognitions, v. 9. Calling riches, in their native tongue, Mammon.

See also on Luke xvi. 9-13, § 105.

v. 25f, Luke xii. 22f. Clement, Paed. II. x. 102, 3. The Lord dividing subjects<sup>2</sup> into (1) life or soul, (2) body, (3) external things, counsels that internal things be procured for the sake of the body, but to regulate the body by the soul, and trains the soul, saying Luke xii. 22-3, and gives a clear example of His teaching, v. 24. So much for food; so also about clothing, which connects with the third class, external things.

v. 27. But Solomon 'exceedingly plumed himself upon his riches.' What is fairer than flowers? What more delightful than lilies or roses? But, v. 28f. The particle 'what' rejects *quality* of food; the meaning is 'Be not careful what kind of things ye eat or drink, for it is greediness and luxury to care for this'; but mere eating simply considered, is a proof of necessity, the

<sup>1</sup> τὰ χρήματα, τὰ ἀργυρία.

<sup>2</sup> ὑποθήκας.

satisfaction, as we have said, of need; but (to care) 'what' pertains to superfluity, and what is superfluous is said by Scripture to be of the devil! The meaning is made clear by what follows. . . , Be ye not lifted up;<sup>1</sup> boastfulness and luxury render a man 'lifted up' from the truth, and softness arising from superfluous things leads away from the truth; therefore He says most finely 'All these things the nations of the world seek after.' The nations are the disorderly and the senseless. 'These things' = luxury, softness, gluttony. . . But as regards bare food, solid and liquid, as being necessary, He says, 'Your Heavenly Father knoweth what you need.' If we are actually seekers, let us not waste our search on luxury, but let us kindle ourselves to find the truth. 'For seek ye the kingdom of God, and the things of food shall be added unto you.'

Origen, *Against Celsus*, vii. 24, p. 711. These words are not contrary to the blessings under the Law, which teach that the righteous eats and is filled, or to Prov. xiii. 25. For in the blessing in the Law, the food of the soul is signified. From the Gospel we may take either a deeper meaning or a simpler, viz. that the soul ought not to be surprised with cares about food and clothing, but, practising simplicity, trust to be provided for by God, if one cares only for necessary things.

Matthew (Possinus' *Catena*). Christ forbids what rich men say in the evening, 'What shall we eat or what shall we put on.'

On Eph. ii. 2 (Cramer's *Catena*). J. Th. St. iii. 402. In the phrase 'fowls of heaven',<sup>2</sup> heaven means the air around us.

Tertullian, *Spectacles*, xxiii. The devil has raised the

<sup>1</sup> μετεωρίζεσθε.

<sup>2</sup> οὐρανός.

tragedians on boots (cothurni) because 'none can add a cubit to his stature ;' he wishes to make Christ a liar.

**Cyprian**, *Work and Alms*, xi. God feeds the birds and the sparrows are afforded daily food, and to those who have no sense of what is divine neither drink nor food is lacking ; do you think that to a Christian, a servant of God, given to good works, dear to his Master, anything will be lacking ?

Testimonies, iii. 11. Proof-text that 'He who has obtained faith, having put off the old man ought to think only of heavenly and spiritual things and not to attend to the world, which he has renounced.' (*v.* 31ff are also quoted.)

*v.* 31f. **Clement**, *Strom.* IV. vi. 34, 6. Seek first the kingdom of heaven, and righteousness, for these are great things ; and the small things, relating to one's livelihood, shall be added to you.

Prophetic Selections, xii. He limits not only pursuits but also cares. God knows clearly what things it is good for us to have, and what to lack. Therefore He bids us, having emptied ourselves of worldly cares, to be filled with care for God.

Paed. I. v. 17, 2. He exhorts us, putting away the cares of life, to depend on the Father alone.

I. xii. 98, 4. The man who is enrolled as Christ's, ought to be sufficient for himself and to minister to himself<sup>1</sup> and further to take up a life of one day at a time.<sup>2</sup>

**Clementine Recognitions**, ii. 20. . . . 'His righteousness' that we may be taught to do rightly ; 'His kingdom' that we may know what is the reward assigned to toil and patience—a recompense to the good, of eternal good

<sup>1</sup> αὐτοδιάκονος.

<sup>2</sup> ἐφήμερον ἐπαναιρεῖσθαι βίον.

things, but to those who have wrought against God's will, a worthy retribution of punishment for each man's deeds.

III. 20. We are bidden to seek these—not the origin of evil.

III. 41. Peter opposes this to Simon's position, that before he can seek after righteousness he must know whether the soul is immortal.

**Cyprian**, *Work and Alms*, ix. He says that all things are assigned and delivered to those who seek the kingdom and righteousness of God; for the Lord, when the day of Judgement shall come, says that they who have worked in His Church are admitted to receive the kingdom.

**Lord's Prayer**, xxi. He promises to afford all things to those who seek God's kingdom and righteousness. For since all things are God's, nothing will fail him who has God, if he himself fail not God. Cp. *Daniel* and *Elijah*.

VII. 1–2. **Irenæus**, IV. 46, 3, H.; IV. xxx. 3, p. 268, M. From 'an Elder'. Not that we should not rebuke sinners, nor that we should consent to things which are ill-done; but that we should not wrongfully judge God's dispositions, since He has provided that all should turn out right.

**Clement**, *Rich Man*, xxxiii. (One may make mistakes in deciding who it is that deserves help.) It is better to do good to the unworthy, than, by penuriousness and pretence of proving who are and who are not fit objects, to neglect some who are dear to God; but by offering in turn to all who need, we must of necessity find some one of those who have power with God to save. . . . Open your heart to all who are enrolled as God's disciples.

**Origen**, *Matthew* in loc. (*Possinus' Catena*.) 'Measure'



means 'Law'; for the Law is the measure of what is just.

Romans, Book IV. 1, p. 523. 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again' applies to evil works. For God does not define the measure of His grace, since it is written 'For God giveth not the Spirit by measure'

On 1 Cor. iv. 5-6 (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. ix, p. 356) he raises the question how 1 Cor. iv. 5-6 and Matt. vii. 1 can be combined with 1 Cor. v. 12.

Tertullian, Patience, x. In this warning He requires patience. For who will not judge another, except he who will be patient in not defending himself? Who judges in order to forgive?—and if he forgive, he has betrayed the impatience of one who judges, and has taken away the honour of the only judge, God.

Chastity, ii. The Lord warns those who judge. He did not forbid to judge, but taught.

Didascalia, 9. Spoken especially to the laity. Judge not your bishop, nor your brethren; if you judge and condemn your brother, you hold your brother for guilty; this means that you condemn yourself, for you are judged along with the guilty. Bishops are empowered to judge; to them it has been said 'Be good money-changers (bankers).'

Luke vi. 37-8. Origen, Martyrdom, xf, p. 280. He who is the very Word and the very Truth would say both to him who has confessed and to him who has denied 'with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again'.

Thou therefore who hast measured with the measure of confession towards Me, and hast filled the measure of confession, wilt receive a measure of confession from Me, 'shaken, pressed, overflowing,' which shall be

given 'into thy bosom'. But thou also who hast measured with the measure of denial, and hast denied Me, wilt receive, correspondingly with thy measure of denial, the measure of My denial of thee. . . .

Let us consider how the measure of confession is filled, or is not filled but deficient. If throughout the whole time of examination and temptation we do not give place in our heart to the devil, who wants to defile us with evil thoughts of denial or double-mindedness or some persuasion provoking us to what is hostile to martyrdom and perfection; and moreover if we do not defile ourselves even by a word alien to confession; and if we endure all the reproach from our opponents, and mocking and laughter and ill-speaking and pity where-with they appear to pity us, supposing us to be mis-led and foolish; and are not led astray by love of children or relations, but turning away from all these things are wholly devoted to God—then we may say we have filled up the measure of confession.

Romans iv. 4-5 (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. xiii. 358). This does not apply to the better <sup>1</sup> works; for 'By grace are ye saved'. Eph. ii. 8f.

Clement, Strom. VII. xiv. 86, 6. The commandment 'Forgive, and it shall be forgiven thee', so to speak constrains to salvation by reason of excess of goodness.

Cyprian, Test. iii. 21, quotes under heading 'Not to judge rashly (temere) of another.'

vv. 3-5. Luke vi. 41-2. Hippolytus, Haer. viii. 1 (8), applies this to heretics.

Origen, Exodus, Hom. x. 3, p. 167. It is clear that He means not the eye of the body, but the eye of the soul.

<sup>1</sup> κρείττονων.

Scripture often by members of the body means members of the soul.

Luke (in Corderius). Let us first correct ourselves and then blame others, and that kindly. There are differences depending on—the judgement, the judges, the persons judged.

(1) If he who judges and rebukes, does so in a kind and friendly way, not bitter or hastily ;

(2) If he does this according to the common law of the state (*ex communi eaque justa rei-publicae lege*) ;

(3) If paying no regard for these things he acts simply from hatred ; or

(4) Rashly, not knowing the facts ; or

(5) When he endeavours to conceal his own disgrace by severity to others.

The sixth difference is if those charged with the same offence set themselves to judge others. For such no excuse exists.

Eph. v. 11 (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. iii. 562). Only those to whom this does not apply will reprove.<sup>1</sup> So the prophets, not being liable to reproof, reproofed the sinners.

Methodius, Leprosy, xviii. 5. The first thing is to correct oneself, and then one's neighbour.

v. 6. Didache, ix. Application, 'Let none eat or drink of your Eucharist, save those baptized in the name of the Lord.'

Basilides used it to justify esoteric teaching (cp. Epiphanius Haer. xxiv, p. 72). 'We are men, all the rest are swine and dogs.' Therefore He said 'Cast not your pearls before swine, nor give what is holy to dogs.'

Clement, Strom. I. xii. 55, 3. It is hard to set forth the pure and clear words concerning the true light to

<sup>1</sup> ἐλέγχειν.

swinish and undisciplined hearers ; scarcely any subjects are more ridiculous to the mass of men, or again more admirable and inspiring to those of good-natured dispositions.

II. ii. 7, 4. It is forbidden to give of holy things to the dogs, so long as they remain mere beasts. For it is never fitting for the envious and disorderly and those of unbelieving character, shameless in barking at enquiry, to dip in the divine and living fountain.

**Hippolytus**, Haer. ix. 12 (17). Elchasai, thinking it unreasonable that great and unspeakable mysteries should be trodden under foot or committed to many, counsels to keep them as precious pearls.

(V. 3 (8), used by the Naasenes.)

**Origen**, Joshua Hom. xxi. 2, p. 447. (Origen interprets Jebusites as 'trampers'.) These hearing the word of God do not go away as unbelievers, nor continue as believers ; but after obtaining knowledge of the mysteries and exploring the secrets of our faith, afterwards turn and attack us . . . trampling on the pearls of the word of the Lord and defiling the adornments of faith.

Ps. xxxvii (xxxviii), Hom. i. 4, p. 684. He calls them swine who delight in the stench of sins, like swine who delight in all stench as if the sweetest scent.

**Tertullian**, Baptism xviii. Baptism is not to be lightly administered.

Prescription of Heretics, xxvi. A command not to deliver the Gospel promiscuously ('passim') or without consideration. The Lord taught openly, without implying any hidden mystery ; cp. x. 27, v. 15 ; Luke xix. 20. The apostles must have followed this.

xli. With heretics it is in the first place uncertain who is a catechumen, who one of the faithful ; they come alike, they hear alike, they pray alike ; even if



any heathen have come in besides, they will cast to dogs what is holy, and to swine pearls—though not true ones.

To his Wife, ii. 5. Your pearls are the distinguishing marks (insignia) of your daily life and conduct. These may not be concealed, and the more this is attempted, the more suspicion is aroused. Some heathens bear with them, but only to 'trample on them', i.e. to mock.

**Clementine Recognitions**, ii. 3. (Hence it is important to know to whom the words of immortality are to be entrusted.)

iii. 1. There is nothing more difficult than to discuss the truth among a mixed assembly. For the fact may not be told to all, because of evil minded and designing hearers; yet it is not right to deceive, because of those who sincerely want to hear the truth. If a speaker to such an assembly conceals what is true, how will he instruct those who are worthy? But if he puts forth the pure and simple truth to those who do not want to attain salvation, he does wrong to Him by whom he was sent, from whom also he received command not to cast the pearls of His words before swine and dogs, who struggling against these pearls with arguments and sophisms, roll them in the mud of carnal understanding, and by their barkings and vile answerings break down and weary the preachers of the word of God.

**Cyprian**, To Demetrianus, i. (Cyprian, bearing this verse in mind had not previously answered Demetrianus. The Lord bids us keep what is holy within our own knowledge—intra conscientiam nostram.)

**Testimonies** iii. 50. Heading, 'That the mystery of faith should not be profaned.'

**Didascalia**, 15. Spoken to widows and all lay-people—not to be free in instructing others.

(Clement), To Virgins, ii. 6. We ought not to copy the heathen, but to shrink from evil in all things, lest we give what is holy to dogs. . . .

Methodius on Things Created.<sup>1</sup> Xenon interprets 'pearls' of the more systematic teachings of divine religion; 'swine' of those who still wallow, as swine in mud, in impiety and various pleasures. Divine teachings must not be cast to them, for they cannot bear them. Methodius objects that this involves that no Christian has turned at the apostles' preaching from former impiety; for they would not have placed the mysteries of Christ before those who by reason of their unbelief were like swine. But in fact these things were set forth and preached to all Greeks and other unbelievers by the disciples of Christ, and turned them from their ungodliness to faith in Christ. So the above interpretation is impossible. We must understand by 'pearls', virtues, with which as with precious pearls, the soul is beautified; we must not associate (or expose<sup>2</sup>) these virtues, as chastity, temperance, righteousness and truth, with impure pleasures which are like swine, lest these, devouring the virtues, may prepare the soul to have a swinish and passion-swayed<sup>3</sup> life.

vv. 7-8. This verse was used by the Valentinians of the duty of rising above the Demiurge, and seeking Bythus or the Father. *Irenæus*, II. xxvi. H.; II. xviii. 6, p. 141, M.

II. xlv. 2, H.; II. xxx. 2, p. 161, M.

II. xxiv. H.; II. xviii. 2, p. 141, M. The Lord makes disciples perfect by seeking and finding the Father. But the aeon Christ of the Valentinians made the aeons per-

<sup>1</sup> περὶ τῶν γενητῶν.

<sup>2</sup> παραβαλεῖν.

<sup>3</sup> πολυπαθῇ.

fect by teaching them not to seek the Father, urging that they will not find Him however much they toil.

Clement, Paed. III. vi. 36, 3. (The Christian alone is rich.) The man to whom it belongs to desire nothing that is not for us <sup>1</sup> but to obtain whatever he desires, and to receive whatever he aims at in a godly manner, on asking it from God—is not he much-possessing and all-possessing, having God as an eternal treasure? For to him who asks, it shall be given; and to him who knocks it shall be opened. If God denies nothing, all things belong to the godly man.

Strom. II. xx. 116, 2. Spoken to those who are of themselves able to choose the best.

I. xi. 51, 4. The Word does not intend the believer to be motionless and inactive towards truth, but He carries seeking to finding.

Origen, Epistle to Gregory, p. 32 (Philocalia, xiii.) Importance of *attending* to the reading of the divine Scriptures. Knock at their closed places, and they will be opened to you by the door-keeper. . . . And attending to the divine reading seek rightly, and with unwavering faith towards God, the meaning of the divine Scriptures which has been concealed from the multitude. But do not be content to knock and seek; for most necessary is prayer for the understanding of what is divine. The Saviour exhorting to this said not only 'Knock and it shall be opened to you'; and 'Seek and ye shall find', but also 'Ask and it shall be given you.'

Against Celsus, vi. 7, p. 634. If some do not act according to the command of Jesus, to seek the mind of the Scriptures, and to ask concerning them from God,

<sup>1</sup> τῶν οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν.

and to knock at their closed places, this does not render the word void of wisdom.

Matthew in loc. (Gallandi.) (Connected with previous verse.) That the disciples may not fail to know who among their hearers are dogs or swine, He says 'Seek unceasingly from God, and all things shall be revealed to you'. For the beginning of virtue is knowledge, through prayer, of what is good; then, knowledge how virtue ought to proceed; <sup>1</sup> thirdly, to knock through one's works that the door may be opened to him; for this is the meaning of knocking with hands.

For the truth of the doctrines of salvation is received in three ways; by diligent prayer, by steadiness <sup>2</sup> of the mind in seeking divine things, and by careful diligence in discovering the depth of the certainty of the secrets of Scripture, for so the Scriptures are opened.

Matthew, Book XIV. 25, p. 650. None of those who do not receive has really asked though he has appeared to do so, since it is not lawful to say that 'Every one that asketh receiveth' is untrue. He who receives has obeyed Jesus' word Mark xi. 24. He who asks ought to do all in his power to pray in the spirit, to pray also in the understanding, and to pray unceasingly.

Ps. xxxiii (xxxiv), (4), 5, p. 648. But he who seeks in an evil way does not find.

Tertullian, Prescription of Heretics, viiif. The heretics quote 'Seek and ye shall find'. Let us remember that the Lord said this at the beginning of his teaching, when it was still doubted among all, whether He were the Christ. . . . He was still to be sought and had not yet been known. The words were spoken especially to the Jews, who could seek Christ in the Scriptures, Luke xvi.

<sup>1</sup> ὁδεῦσαι.

<sup>2</sup> κατὰστασις.



29 ; John v. 39. So ' Knock ' was said to the Jews, who had been within God's house, <sup>1</sup> but cast, out from thence for their sins, had begun to be outside. The Gentiles had always been outside. Isa. xl. 15, how shall they knock or even know the door ? . . . So again, ' Ask and ye shall receive ' suits him who knew from whom he was to seek, by whom something had been promised him ; the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whom the Gentiles knew not, nor His promise. (But we, taught by the Apostles, themselves taught by the Holy Spirit, have no need to seek.)

But granting that ' Seek and ye shall find ' was said to all, its meaning has to be carefully explained. No divine saying is to be taken simply literally, without considering its meaning. Seeking cannot go on indefinitely ; you must seek till you find and believe when you have found ; then all you have to do is to keep what you have believed ; believing moreover that nothing else is to be believed or sought. Three points are to be considered—the thing, the time, the limit—(1) *what* is to be sought ; (2) *when* ; (3) up to what point. You must seek what Christ ordained ; but only so long as you do not find, until you find. But you found it when you believed ; there is no more seeking or finding. Otherwise, what limit is there ? With Marcion ? But Valentinus also puts forward ' seek, and ye shall find ' ; so do Apelles, Hebion, Simon, etc.

No one seeks anything unless he either has not had it, or has lost it. There is a limit to seeking, knocking, asking, cp. Luke xi. 9. But if we must always be seeking, where must we seek ? among the heretics ? No, among ourselves. The rule of faith is enough. . . . Let curiosity give way to faith !

<sup>1</sup> penes Deum.

xliii. Heretics associate with magicians, astrologers, philosophers, given to curiosity ; they always remember ' seek and ye shall find.'

**Clementine Homilies**, iii. 52. Since the truth is not obvious. *vv.* 9-11. Luke xi. 11-13. **Origen**, Matthew in loc. (Gallandi), with fragment on Luke (Gallandi and Corderius). ' Bread ' probably means the necessary food of the soul, in knowledge, without which it is not possible to be saved ; e.g. an accurate account how one must live. But ' fish ' being a relish <sup>1</sup> means desire of learning,<sup>2</sup> e.g. to know the constitution of the world. . . . (Wisdom, vii. 17f.) So therefore instead of bread God gives not a stone, which the devil wished to be eaten by Jesus ; nor instead of a fish a serpent, which the Ethiopians eat who are unworthy to eat fish (Ps. lxxiii (iv), 13-14, LXX), nor in short, instead of what is nourishing and helpful, things uneatable and hurtful.

How is it that He called the disciples ' evil ' ? Though they followed Him from free choice, they yet had human mutability. The Son of God alone was immutable, both in divinity and humanity.

' Good gifts ' = spiritual gifts, cp. Luke xi. 13, ' the Holy Spirit,' which means the same. The Holy Spirit is the good Light ; therefore He gives good things to them that partake of Him. But to those who are exceedingly evil, because sinning incessantly, wickedness becomes in some way their nature, like Satan and the daemons. They may be called evil by nature, though made such not by creation but by their own choice.

(The last two paragraphs occur only in Gallandi's fragment on Matthew. The first paragraph is pieced from both sources.)

<sup>1</sup> ὄψον.

<sup>2</sup> φιλομάθεια.

Prayer, x. 2, p. 213. The good Father when we ask Him for the living Bread (not the stone which the adversary wills to become food for Jesus and His disciples) gives it to those who have received the Spirit of adoption from the Father. The Father gives the good gift, raining it from Heaven to those who ask Him.

Ps. xxxvi (xxxvii), Hom. ii. 4, p. 661. (Difference of *πονηρός*, 'nequam, malignus,' from other sinful qualities—cp. Ps. x. 15.) The devil is called not simply a sinner, but the Evil One (Rufinus renders *πονηρός*, 'malignus vel malus') as in the Lord's Prayer. *πονηρία*, 'nequitia,' means wilful wickedness. It is one thing to do evil things through ignorance, and be overcome by evil; another thing to do evil things voluntarily and zealously. This is wickedness (nequitia). The Lord said Matt. vii. 11, reproaching us.

Cyprian, Epistle lv. 23. The Lord shows the Fatherly kindness (pietas) of God the Father. The Lord here compares the father according to the flesh with the eternal and abundant fatherliness (pietas) of God the Father.

Clementine Homilies, iii. 56. Spoken to those who think that God is not good.

v. 12; Luke vi. 31. Clement, Paed. III. xii. 88. A summary principle<sup>1</sup> and exhortation of life, embracing all things.

Tertullian, Against Marcion iv. 16. In this precept the negative side is also understood. 'As ye would not have done to you by men, neither do ye to them.' If a new God taught this, who has not previously fashioned me so as first to know what I ought to will and not to will for myself, and so also to do to others what I

<sup>1</sup> ὑποθήκη.

should will for myself and not to do what I should not will for myself; then He has not bound me to conformity of will and deed, that I should do to others what I should will for myself, e.g. love, respect, comfort, protection; and not do what I should not will, violence, wrong, dishonour, fraud, etc.; with this inconsistency of will and deed the nations act, not yet taught of God. For although good and evil is known by nature, yet it is not by God's teaching, by the knowledge of which we at last act with concordance of will and deed, by faith, as under the fear of God.

*vv.* 13-14. **Clement**, *Protrepticus*, x. 100, 1. The Lord is the Way; narrow, but from Heaven; narrow, but leading to Heaven; despised as narrow on earth, but worshipped as broad in Heaven.

*Strom.* V. v. 31. The Gospel and the Apostles, like all the Prophets, lay down two ways, and call the one which is confined according to the commandments and prohibitions 'strait and narrowed'; but the other which leads to destruction, they call 'wide and roomy,' without hindrance to pleasures or passion.

*IV.* vi. 34. 'Many,' through prodigality, love of women, love of glory, or of office, or the like passions.

**Hippolytus**, *Haer.* v. 3 (8), gives use of the verse 6 by the Naassenes (Phrygians).

**Origen**, *Ps.* xvi (xvii) 3-4, p. 601. That of action, which if now one of pain and not of joy, yet afterwards procures fruits of righteousness to those trained thereby.

*Ps.* cxviii (cxix) 32; p. 800. (Narrow and wide ways are contrasted with narrow and wide hearts.) The way which leads to life is narrow and straitened, but the wide and broad heart, widened by the Word, is holy and will see God, and runs the good course of the way of God's commandments. So the wide and broad way



leads to destruction ; but the narrow heart, not containing in itself the abode of Father and Son, separates from God by reason of its narrowness the man who has made it such by his own wickedness.

John, Tome vi. 19 (11), p. 120. Jesus Christ, Who said ' I am the Way ', is the good way which leads to the good Father the good man who brings forth good things from the good treasure, and the good and faithful servant. But this way is strait, many who are great of flesh not being able to walk it ; and moreover it is a way pressed by those who struggle <sup>1</sup> to walk by it—since it is called not ' pressing ' <sup>2</sup> but ' pressed '.<sup>3</sup> For the way which lives and perceives the character of him who walks it, is pressed by him who has not loosed the shoes from his feet, nor genuinely accepts that the place on which he stands or which he walks, is holy ground.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies, iii. 6. Heading ' All the good and righteous have more trouble but ought to endure, because they are being proved.'

*vv.* 15–20 ; Luke vi. 43–5. **Irenæus**, Haer. Proem. Applied to heretics speaking like ourselves, but differently minded.

**Clement**, Protrepticus, i. 4, 3. He calls others in an allegory wolves clothed in sheeps' fleeces, pointing to those who ravage in forms of men.

**Origen**, Romans, Book X. 35, p. 684. Watchful perception and an attentive mind is needed, to distinguish either the open simplicity of the sheep, or the lurking rapacity of the wolf. See the danger of those who neglect to be exercised in divine Scriptures, whence alone comes discernment of this kind.

<sup>1</sup> βιαζομένων.

<sup>2</sup> θλίβουσα.

<sup>3</sup> τεθλιμμένη.

**Clement**, Paed. II. v. 45, 1. The speech <sup>1</sup> is the fruit of the mind.

**Origen**, Luke (Cramer and Mai; Latin in Corderius). The good tree is the Holy Spirit; the bad tree the devil and his servants. He that has the Holy Spirit shows forth His fruits, which the Apostle enumerates; but he who holds the opposing power, brings forth as fruit passions of disgrace, thorns and thistles.

**Tertullian**, Prescription of Heretics, iv. What are those sheepskins, but the outward surface of the Christian name? Who are ravening wolves, but deceitful minds and spirits, lurking to attack Christ's flock from within?

Soul, xxi. Valentinians hold according to this passage, that natures are absolutely fixed. But cp. Matt. iii. 7-9; Eph. v. 8, etc. There is no real discrepancy. An evil tree will not give good fruit unless it is grafted, and a good one will give bad fruit if it is not cultivated.

Against All Heresies, vi. Marcion, on the ground of the saying 'A good tree bears good fruits but an evil tree evil ones,' ventured to approve the heresy of Cerdon (i.e. that there were two Gods; a harsh Creator and a good Supreme revealed by Christ).

Against Marcion, i. 2. Marcion draws his conception of two Gods from the single passage where the Lord uses, with reference not to Gods but to men, the example of a good and an evil tree. But neither the good can bring forth evil fruit nor the evil good fruit, i.e. neither a good mind or faith produces evil works nor an evil one good works. But Marcion, troubled about the origin of evil and finding the Creator declaring 'I am He who creates evil' (Isa. xlv. 7) interpreted the evil tree bearing evil fruit to be the Creator, and supposed

<sup>1</sup> λόγος.

there must be another God in the position of the good tree bearing good fruit. (Cp. Hippolytus Haer. x. 15-11.)

IV. 17. Apelles ought to have remembered v. 40; he was Marcion's disciple and improved on him. Let the heretic take the beam out of his own eye; then let him reprove<sup>1</sup> any mote in a Christian's eye.

As a good tree may not bear evil fruit because truth does not bear heresy; nor an evil tree good, because neither does heresy bear truth; so neither has Marcion brought forth any good from the evil treasure of Cerdon, nor Apelles from that of Marcion. We interpret Christ's figures spoken of men much more suitably of them than Marcion does of two Gods.

(Cyprian)—To Novatian, xiv. Here ravening wolves are those who conspire with crafty mind to assail the flock of Christ.

Clement, Rich Man, xvii. The Lord knows of two kinds of treasure, one good and one evil. There is with Him, not only one treasure, as with us, that which being found affords great gain of a sudden; but also a second—that which affords no gain or envy, and is ill won and injurious.

Origen, First Principles, II. v. 4, p. 88. The heretics appeal to these words (and xii. 33). The Law, they say, is a tree, known by its commandments. If the Law is found good, without doubt also He Who gave it is believed to be a good God; but if it is found just rather than good, God will be thought simply a just Lawgiver.

But Paul plainly declared the commandment of the Law to be holy and just and good.

Leviticus, Hom. xvi. 4, p. 266. Trees are virtues or vices within us. He teaches 'A tree of purity is good,

<sup>1</sup> Revincat.

it cannot bear fruit of impurity. A tree of righteousness is good, it cannot bear fruit of unrighteousness. So on the other side, if you have the root of an evil tree planted in your mind, it cannot bear good fruit.'

On Lamentations iii. 38, p. 347. From the Lord's mouth cannot have come forth contrary things, good and evil; for neither doth a good tree bear evil fruit, nor an evil tree good fruit.

Romans, Book VI. 5, p. 574. A man's purpose and will is called a tree, whether good or evil; and works its fruit.

Manichaeans made use of the passage—(Epiphanius, Haer. lxvi. 62, p. 675).

Acts of Archelaus (Hegemonius), 5. Manes (Manichaeus) quotes it accusing the orthodox of daring to say that God is the Creator of Satan and his evil doings, not believing these words in the Gospels. So again, ch. 18.

Adamantius, i. 28, p. 821. Megethius quotes v. 18. Adamantius answers 'This passage is not spoken of natures, but of men. If He had been speaking of natures, He would not have mentioned fruits, for He says it is impossible to change.' Adamantius quotes the whole passage, and the parallels, Luke vi. 45; Matt. xv. 19. The Saviour says that both good and evil are produced from one nature of men. What kind of tree was Paul—good or corrupt? Megethius says, 'I am not asking about Paul'; but Adamantius continues 'He was formerly a persecutor; afterwards he became an apostle. How then has the corrupt tree become good, if a corrupt tree cannot bear good fruit? And what kind of tree was Judas originally? No doubt a good tree, since he was an apostle.'

vv. 21-5. II Clement, iv. 1-3. Let us not only call Him Lord, for this will not save us. For He saith 'Not



every one that saith unto Me "Lord, Lord," shall be saved, but he that doeth righteousness.' So then let us confess Him in our deeds by loving one another. . . .

Origen, Matthew in loc. (Possinus' Catena). No one can say Lord, Lord, but in the Holy Spirit. But this is in works, not, as some suppose, in words. Some unworthy men prophesied in Christ's Name—Balaam and Saul and Caiaphas; some cast out demons, as Judas and the sons of Sceva.

On Ps. iv. 1 (2), p. 557. To say perfectly 'Lord', is when one's works also utter a voice and say 'Lord, Lord.'

Ps. xxxvi (xxxvii), Hom. iii. 9, p. 667 (on v. 18). According to Scripture the Lord knows, not all things, but only those things which are good; He is said to be ignorant of the evil; not because there is really anything which escapes His knowledge, but because He is said to be ignorant of what is unworthy of His knowledge. Cp. 1 Cor. xiv. 37-8. So the Lord says in the Gospel to some, 'I know you not, depart from Me, ye workers of iniquity.'

So Genesis, Hom. iv. 6, p. 73. We may say boldly that according to the Scriptures God does not know all men. God does not know sin, and does not know sinners; He does not know those who are strangers to Him. Cp. 2 Tim. ii. 19; Matt. vii. 23; 1 Cor. xiv. 37-8.

Jeremiah, Hom. i. 8, p. 130. The Saviour is greater by not knowing some things than by knowing them. Does the 'I never knew you, of Matt. vii. 23, present His power as less or as greater and more wonderful, because He knew not men who were worse and perishing? For He knew the greater and superior things.' Cp. 1 Tim. ii. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 37-8. The

sinner is not known by God. . . . Sinners and workers of iniquity are not worth His knowledge.

So Rom. vii. 7, p. 603. All that is evil is held unworthy of His knowledge or foreknowledge. He says this to those not worthy to be known by God.

Matthew, § 33, p. 853. Those mighty works are not from Christ who knew them not, but from him who transforms himself not only into an angel of light but even into Christ Himself.

John, Tome x. 44 (28), p. 210, on John ii. 23. We must hold to Him rather than to His Name, lest doing miracles by His Name we hear what was said to those who boasted in His Name only. . . .

Romans, Book IV, 1, p. 523. To workers of iniquity punishment is paid as if due as the wages of iniquity.

Hippolytus, Haer. v. 3 (8), says *v.* 21 was used by the Naassenes (Phrygians).

*v.* 21. Cyprian, Testimonies, iii. 19. Heading 'We must obey not our own will, but that of God.'

*v.* 22. iii. 26. Heading 'It is not enough to be baptized and to receive the Eucharist, unless a man make progress in deeds and work.'

Epistle lxxiii. 16. This verse (21) overthrows the position of those who put forward the name of Christ to pervert Christian truth, saying that those baptized everywhere and in any manner in the name of Jesus Christ have received the grace of baptism.

Unity of the Catholic Church, xv. To prophesy and cast out demons and do great miracles on earth is certainly a high and wonderful thing; yet not every one who is found in all these things attains the kingdom of heaven, unless in his walking he keeps the straight and right way.

(Cyprian)—Rebaptism, vii. In the name of Jesus all

miracles are wont to be wrought, sometimes and in some cases by outsiders (*ab hominibus extraneis*). (These words of Christ) serve to show us that sometimes these things can be wrought even by those who work iniquity, through the exceeding power of the name of Jesus.

**Adamantius**, i. 12, p. 813. The Gospel agrees with the Law. Christ will hate as enemies those who do evil, saying 'Depart from Me. . . .' To thrust away enemies does not belong to love.

**Clementine Homilies**, viii. 7. (Closer to Luke vi. 46.) None are profited by calling their teachers 'Lords', but not doing the acts of servants. Wherefore even Jesus said to one who constantly called Him 'Lord', but did nothing of what He enjoined him, 'Why callest thou Me Lord, Lord, and doest not what I say?' For saying will profit none, but doing.

Luke vi. 46. **Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 17. The Jews never called any God and Lord but Him Whom they now acknowledge. Hence these words must mean the God of the Jews. They were spoken by Him Who from the beginning had delivered to them the oracles of the Law and Prophets.

**Origen**, Rom. ii. 13, p. 494. Everywhere faith is joined with works and works associated with faith.

*vv.* 24-6. Luke vi. 47-9. **Irenæus**, III. xxxviii. 2, H.; III. xxiv. 2, p. 223, M. Heretics are not founded on the one rock, but on the sand which has in itself many stones. Accordingly they invent many gods.

**Origen**, Martyrdom xlviii, p. 307. We have long ago heard the words of Jesus, and been made disciples to the Gospel, and have all built ourselves a house. But where we have built it, on the rock, after digging and going deep, or on the sand, without foundation, the present conflict will show. For a storm is upon us,

bringing rain and streams and winds, or as Luke calls it, a flood ; and these beating on the house either will not have strength to shake it, and therefore the house will not fall, because founded on the rock, i.e. Christ ; or else they will reveal the worthlessness of the building, which will collapse by reason of the present occasion. May that fate be far from our buildings ! For great is the fall which consists of denial. . . .

Let us pray to be like the wise (prudent) man who built his house on the rock. Let there come upon such a building the rain from the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places, or the streams of our enemies, the principalities and powers, or the rough winds from the world-rulers of this darkness, or the flood of the spirits below ; and let them dash themselves on our building on the rock, that by the house not only not falling but not even being at all shaken, the forces at work may suffer at our hands rather than accomplish anything.

Matthew in loc. (Cramer's Catena.) Rain=the devil ; streams=anti-christs ; winds=the spiritual hosts of the wickedness.

Prov. i. 2, p. 2. He lays his foundation on the rock, i.e. on the faith of Christ, so as to hold out against rains and winds and blasts, i.e. temptations from any quarter.

Jeremiah, Hom. i. 15, p. 135. The building on the sand is the devil's ; for it has been established in nothing firm, sure and united ; but the building on the rock is God's.

Cyprian, Testimonies, iii. 96. ' We must work by deeds, not words.'

Unity of Catholic Church, ii. He calls those who keep His commandments strong and stable, founded



with solid mass upon the rock, settled with immovable and unshaken firmness against all the tempests and whirlwinds of the world.

(Cyprian), To Novatian, v. This refers to those who have lapsed under stress of persecution.

Methodius, Symposium, xi. 1. Tempests means lusts ; the rock is the immovable and inviolable establishment of the soul as regards purity.

Meats, xiii. 2 (Bonwetsch, p. 305). The Lord desiring that every one of us should build houses through virtue, compared to a wise man who built his house on the rock. He calls himself the rock ; the house is the stronghold of faith.

Eusebius (Cramer's Catena, in loc.) The house is the working <sup>1</sup> of virtue ; the rock is faith ; the winds and rains and streams are every form of temptation.

## XLII

MATT. viii. 5-13 ; LUKE vii. 1-10

Irenæus, Haer. I. i. 13, H. ; I. vii. 5, pp. 34-5, M. The Valentinians say that the Centurion represents the Demiurge, who approached to the Saviour willingly with all his power.

IV. lviii. 10, H. ; IV. xxxvi. 8, p. 281, M. (One and the same God chose the patriarchs and called the Gentiles.) If those who believe in Him from the East and the West through the proclamation of His Apostles, will sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven, sharing a banquet with them ; it is shown that one and the same God chose the patriarchs, visited the people, and called the Gentiles.

<sup>1</sup> ἐργασία.

**Tertullian**, *Against Marcion*, iv. 18. In praising the Centurion's faith, it is improbable that He would have professed that He had not found such in Israel, if the faith of Israel had nothing to do with Him.

Objection: 'Why might He not have taken an example of a faith strange<sup>1</sup> to Him?' Answer: 'Then He would have said that such faith had never been in Israel—not that He ought to have found such faith in Israel.'

**Origen**, *John*, Tome xiii. 62 (60), p. 278. (Origen distinguishes the cure of the nobleman's son from that of the centurion's servant; though both were wrought at a distance, and both took effect at Capernaum.)

*Matthew* in loc. (Cramer). The centurion held Jesus to have authority over life and death, wherefore He marvelled. He found no one at Jerusalem confident against death.

*Matthew* in loc. (Cramer and Gallandi). How shall the 'many enter' if the way is strait and narrowed, and few find it? . . . Answer: Few of Israel are saved; for not many of them believed on Him, cp. *Luke* xii. 32. 'Many will come' was said prophetically, of those who would believe on Him from the Gentiles. These are many times more numerous than those of Israel who acknowledge Jesus Christ.

'Shall sit down in Abraham's bosom' reminds of the parable of the man who made a marriage feast for his son.

*Romans*, Book V. 5, p. 556. 'Many' shall come—not 'all'.

v. 12. **Origen**, *John*, Tome xiii. 60, p. 276. *Heracleon* thinks that here is shown the destruction of the men of the Demiurge.

<sup>1</sup> *Alienae*.

Jeremiah, Hom. xii. 13, p. 204, on 'your soul shall weep'. There is a weeping where the soul alone weeps; perhaps the Saviour teaches us this when He says 'There shall be the weeping.'

Ps. i. pp. 533f (Frag. in Epiphanius.) Those who take the material view of the Resurrection appeal to Ez. xxxvii; also to Matt. viii. 12. 'There shall be the weeping. . .', and x. 28; Rom. viii. 11. But careful examination of these passages leads to the opposite conclusion. . . . In this life the Creator has fashioned every member for some use; so the teeth to masticate solid food. What need is there of teeth to those under punishment? For, they hold, they will not eat when in Gehenna. 'Teeth' are spoken of figuratively—Ps. iii. 7; lviii. 7. So the soul has a gnawing power, which in the time of trial for sins will figuratively gnash the teeth.

Methodius, Resurrection, III. vii. (Bonwetsch, p. 261), criticizes the above view of Origen. If there is no need of foot or hand, there is no need that their form should rise.

Cyprian, Lord's Prayer, xiii. The Jews were formerly sons of the kingdom, while they continued to be also sons of God; after the name of Father ceased as regards them, the Kingdom also ceased.

Testimonies, i. 23. Heading 'That Gentiles rather than Jews come to the Kingdom of Heaven.'

v. 8. Clementine Recognitions, iv. 33. He who has received soldiers under him, though himself inferior and they superior to him in strength, yet says to this one 'go' and he goes, and to another 'come' and he comes, and to another 'do this', and he does. But he has the power not by his own strength, but by the fear of Caesar. So each believer commands daemons, although

they appear to him much stronger than men; not by reason of his own strength, but by reason of the power of God who has subjected them.

## XLIII

## LUKE vii. 11-17

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 18. He raised the widow's son; no new sign (documentum). The Creator's prophets had effected this, how much more the Son!. . . They referred the glory to the Creator saying 'A great prophet has arisen among us' and 'God has visited His people.' What God? Assuredly He Whose the people were and from Whom were the prophets. They glorified the Creator; Christ, hearing and knowing this, did not correct them.

**Origen**, Ps. lxxxviii (ix) 13, p. 775. Tabor is the mountain in Galilee on which Christ was transfigured; Hermonieim is the mountain on which lies the city of Nain, in which Christ raised the widow's son.

## XLIV

MATT. xi. 2-6; LUKE vii. 18-23.

MATT. xi. 7-19; LUKE vii. 24-35.

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 18. 'John is offended<sup>1</sup> on hearing of the mighty works of Christ, as of Another.'<sup>2</sup> Tertullian explains 'When the Lord of Hosts (powers) Himself the Word and Spirit of the Father was now working on earth and preaching, it was necessary for the portion of the Holy Spirit, which according to the measure of a prophet had wrought in John the preparation of the Lord's ways, should now

<sup>1</sup> Scandalizatur.

<sup>2</sup> Alterius.



depart from John, being absorbed into the Lord as into its sum and mass. Therefore John, now a common man and one of the crowd, was 'offended' as man, but not as hoping for or understanding another Christ. . . John was assured, as a Jew, let alone as a prophet, that there is no other God but the Creator. His question was a simple enquiry whether He Whom he was expecting had come—'Art Thou He that comes', i.e. 'who is to come', or 'do we look for another', i.e. 'is there another for whom we look, if thou art not He whom we look for as to come?' He was hoping, according to the opinion of all, from the likeness of the signs, that a prophet might have been sent in the meanwhile (interim), distinct from whom there might be a greater, even the Lord who was expected to come. John was 'offended' in that he doubted whether He whom they expected had really come, whom they ought to have recognized from the works predicted of Him, as the Lord sent the message to John that He was to be known by these works. (These were predicted of the Creator's Christ.)

Baptism, x. What had been from Heaven in John, the Spirit of Prophecy, after the passing of the whole Spirit into the Lord, failed so far that he sent to ask Him whom he had proclaimed and had pointed out as coming, whether He were the One?

Origen, *Witch of Endor*, vii. p. 495. He does not ask simply 'Art Thou He that cometh?' for he knew this; he had seen His glory, had said much of His wondrousness, being the first to bear witness to Him, John i. 14-15. . . Some not understanding what is said, say that John though so great, did not know Christ, but the Holy Spirit had departed from him. . . . But in fact, having seen the glory of Christ, he doubted and perhaps felt

unbelief whether He Who was so glorious would come down even to Hades and to the abyss. Cp. Peter, Matt. xvi. 16-22.

Matthew in loc. (Cramer). John's enquiry was not for his own sake alone, but also for the sake of those who were sent. They needed to know if it were He who had come; but this John knew, and perhaps had taught his disciples but failed to persuade them. But they thought him to be humble. But John needed to know whether He was still to come—viz. among those below, where John had made ready to go.

John, Tome vi. 37 (21), p. 136f. Since he failed to apprehend what was to follow (the Lord's life on earth) not knowing whether it were Jesus who was coming whither he was to go beheaded from the prison, or whether it was necessary to expect another, he therefore in John i. 27, hints the difficulty afterwards plainly put.

(This interpretation of the descent to Hades is held also by Hippolytus, Antichrist, 45, and Adamantius, below.)

Origen, Luke, Hom. xxvii. p. 964. John in prison was anxious not about death, not about the uncertainty of his trial, but while in bonds was thinking of Christ whom he had announced. Because he could not go himself, he sent his disciples with the enquiry. . . . Notice that he taught even in prison, having disciples there. . . . Some question having arisen about Jesus, he sends some of them. . . . By the Saviour's words John is armed for the fight, and dies confidently; the Voice is freely beheaded, supported by the voice of the Lord that He whom he believed was the true Son of God.

John, Tome i. 5 (7), p. 7. John the Baptist expressing the voice of all the people, sends to Jesus and says, 'Art Thou He that cometh, or do we look for another?' For

the Christ was to the people an expected good ; by the preaching of the prophets concerning Him all those who were under the Law and Prophets had their hope in Him—down to the ‘ man in the street ’.<sup>1</sup>

**Adamantius**, i. 26, p. 819. (Greek and Latin often differ here.) Megethius argues that the Christ of the Law and the Prophets was a stranger. For John did not recognize Him ; it was impossible for one who was a prophet from his birth to have been ignorant of his Christ. He quotes xi. 2–3. Adamantius points out that the question was not ‘ Art Thou the Christ ? ’ He who said ‘ Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world ’ was not ignorant that this was He ; but being the Forerunner he asked whether he would be such also in Hades. . . .

Since his disciples had read of two comings of the Messiah, but did not know that it was He who was to go forth from the world (Latin, ‘ to fulfil both advents ’,) John sent the disciples to the Lord to learn that He was the Messiah ; lest they should fail after His death. . . He received them and instructed them by His works that they might be persuaded that He was the whole Truth.

v. 7. **Origen**, 1 Thessalonians (Frag. from Jerome), p. 694. (Contrast between First and Second Advents.) Then they went into the wilderness to hear the Forerunner of the Man (Manhood) taken up (by the Word) and to see a reed shaken by the wind, of which have been made pipes and a vocal reed which sounds with a sweet tune in the mouth of boys singing in the streets and saying ‘ we have sung to you and ye have not danced ’ (but *then* will be the voice of the archangel and the trump of God).

<sup>1</sup> τῶν τυχόντων.



**Epiphanius**, Haer. xxvi. 6, p. 88. *Gnostics*. John was not perfect, for he was inspired by many spirits, like a reed that is moved by every wind. When the spirit of the Prince prevailed, he preached Judaism, but when the Holy Spirit, he spoke about Christ. Hence *v.* 11 (*q. v.*)

**Clement**, Paed. II. x. 109, 3. Scoffing at those who wear soft robes. In earthly courts there is mad thirst for glory, flattery and deceit.

**Tertullian**, Idolatry, xviii. The Lord would not have said *v.* 8 if He had not been plain in dress (*incultus vestitu*).

*v.* 9f. **Irenæus**, III. xi. 8, H.; III. xi. 4, p. 189, M. All the other prophets announced the coming of the Father's Light; they longed to be worthy to see Him whom they foretold; but John both announced Him beforehand like others, and saw Him coming and pointed to Him; and persuaded many to believe in Him; so that he had the place both of a prophet and an apostle. For this is more than a prophet, since 'first are apostles, secondly prophets'—but all things are from one and the same God.

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 18. Christ bears witness to John, establishing him to be a prophet, nay an angel, applying what is written of him 'Behold I send My angel before thy face, who shall prepare thy way', graciously mentioning the prophecy to bestow a higher conception of John who had been offended, that establishing that John had come as His forerunner, he might wipe out the doubt<sup>1</sup> of his question 'Art Thou He that cometh, or do we expect another?' For since the forerunner had already discharged his office by preparing the Lord's way, the Master<sup>2</sup> was to be understood, to Whom the Forerunner had ministered. (continued below).

<sup>1</sup> *Scrupulum*.

<sup>2</sup> *Iipse*.



Single Marriage, viii. More than a prophet—one who not only persuaded or openly pointed out, but even baptized Christ.

Origen, Joshua, Hom. iii. 3, p. 403. The spies sent before the face of Joshua (Jesus) may be thought angels of God according to Mal. iii. 1. What was done by others invisibly was accomplished by John visibly, of whom also this very thing was written.

John, Tome ii. 31 (25), p. 83. Reading this prophecy we consider whether John is actually one of the holy angels sent down to minister as our Saviour's Forerunner. It is nothing wonderful if when the Firstborn of all creation became Incarnate, for love of man some angels also became emulators and imitators of Christ, having chosen to aid His kindness towards man by means of a like body. Cp. Luke i. 44, and the apocryphal 'Prayer of Joseph', which teaches that the just men of old had been angels who had taken man's nature.

VI. 15 (8), p. 117. (See on John i. 21, p. 327.)

VI. 20 (12f), p. 121f. *Heracleon*. (See on John i. 21). . . . Again, not only Heracleon but as far as Origen knows all the heterodox . . . have supposed John to be greater than Elijah and all the prophets because of the words 'Greater among those born of women than John is there none'; not seeing that this phrase is true in two ways—not only by his being greater than all, but also by some being equal to him; for it is true that while many prophets were equal to him, according to the grace given him none was greater than he. Heracleon thinks his superiority is established by his being the subject of Isaiah's prophecy, since none of those who have ever yet prophesied has been counted worthy of the honour by God. But he ventured to say this despising what is called the old covenant and not noticing that Elijah was

a subject of Malachi's prophecy, cp. also Joshiah, and possibly Samson (Gen. xlix. 16).

**Adamantius** ii. 18, p. 867. Christ is announced by the Law and Prophets ; for the Saviour Himself says of John, Matt. xi. 10. This promise having then been made by the prophets, that John should be sent as forerunner of the Lord before His face to prepare the way of God, can they show any other before whose face he was sent ? If any other has come before Christ, sent by the Demiurge, let them show it ; but if no one has appeared save only our Lord Jesus Christ, and John has come before Him ; it is clear that the promise was then fulfilled, and that Christ is of no other God but the Demiurge to whom also the Prophets and the Law belonged.

**Clementine Recognitions**, i. 60. One of John's disciples declared that John was the Christ, and not Jesus ; for Jesus Himself declared John greater than all men and prophets, therefore to be held greater than Moses or Jesus Himself ; if greater than they, he must be the Christ. Simon the Cananaean replied that John was indeed greater than all prophets and than all the sons of women, but not greater than the Son of Man. Jesus is the Christ ; John only a prophet. The difference between them is that between a forerunner and the person before whom he runs ; between him who gives the Law and him who keeps the Law.

v. 11. **Clement**, Rich Man, 31. 'The least in the Kingdom of Heaven', i.e. His own disciple, is, He says, greater than John, the greatest of those born of women.

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iv. 18. John the Fore-runner is greater than all born of women, without him who has been less in the kingdom of God being therefore subject to him ; as if of one God were the kingdom

in which any little <sup>1</sup> one will be greater than John ; and of another, John who is greater than all born of women. For whether He speaks of any one little by humility, or of Himself because He was held less than John, all flocking into the wilderness to John rather than to Christ (‘ What went ye out into the wilderness to see ? ’) is all one ; it is suitable to the Creator that John should be His, greater than those born of women, and also Christ or any little one, who would be greater than John in the kingdom which is equally the Creator’s, and who would be so much greater than the prophet, because he would not be offended in Christ, which thus made John less.

**Epiphanius**, Haer. xxvi. 6–7, pp. 88–9 *Gnostics*, maintaining John’s imperfection. ‘ The Lord said of *us*, that he who is less among us is greater than John.’

**Origen**, in loc. (Gallandi). ‘ The lesser ’ is Christ, who was lesser in the opinion of His hearers. But ‘ in the kingdom of heaven ’, i.e. in spiritual and all heavenly and divine things, Christ is greater than he. [Origen avowedly takes ‘ in the kingdom of heaven ’ with ‘ greater ’ not with ‘ less ’, after which he puts a pause.] But the kingdom of heaven is Christ Himself, exhorting all to repentance and drawing to Himself through grace.

John, Tome xx. 4, p. 312. In so far as any is the seed of later righteous men, so much the more principles <sup>2</sup> of righteousness does he bear ; so Ps. cv. 6. This may be the reason for what is said of John.

Romans, Book III. 2, p. 506. He who is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he who is still in the body, although he be that John than whom there was none greater among those born of women.

<sup>1</sup> Modicus.

<sup>2</sup> λόγους.



[Apparently Origen here takes ' Kingdom of God ' of the *future* life.]

**Methodius**, Free-will, Part II. (Life and Rational Conduet), Bonwetsch, p. 69. John proved himself as the greatest among us men, on account of the simplicity of his clothing, the cheapness of his food and the scantiness of his table.

**Hegemonius**, lviii (xlix). Jesus was not less than John in the kingdom of heaven, but less than he among those born of women, while greater in the kingdom of heaven.

(Hegemonius here applies the same construction as Origen, Matthew, above ; cp. Tertullian.)

v. 12f. Luke xvi. 16. **Justin**, Dialogue, 51. He said this, meaning that there would no more arise a prophet among your race, and that they might recognize that the new covenant announced of old as to be enacted, was then already present, even Himself as the Christ.

**Irenæus**, IV. xli. 1, H ; IV. xxxvii. 6, p. 283, M. What crown is there for those who have not attained it as victors in the strife? Therefore the Lord said the Kingdom of Heaven was an object of violence, ' and they who use force carry it off ' ; i.e. earnest watchers with force and struggle carry it off.

**Origen**, Leviticus, Hom. iv. 4, p. 200. There are good and evil spoilers (raptores). Of the good the Saviour says that they carry off the kingdom of heaven.

**Numbers**, Hom. vii. 5, p. 292. Unless there were some to whom violence was to be done, some who ought to be driven and thrust out thence, it would never be said that the kingdom of heaven had to be carried off by violence.

**Joshua**, Hom. xii. 1, p. 426. The kingdoms of heaven are promised you by the Gospel. But these kingdoms are not empty ; they have their inhabitants,



sinful and apostate spirits (you have to cast them out from the heavenly places, so as to get possession of them). The Lord clearly shows this in the Gospel, Matt. xi. 12.

**Clement**, Strom. V. iii. 16, 7. Those who carry off the kingdom, violent, not by contentious words, but by diligence of upright life and by unceasing prayer, have been said to take it by force <sup>1</sup> having blotted out the stains of their former sins.

VI. xvii. 149, 5. We struggle by force <sup>2</sup> to be Christians; for the kingdom belongs specially to the 'violent' who by investigation and learning and perfect self-discipline reap their kingship.

**Rich Man**, 21. The kingdom of God does not belong to the sleepers or the lazy, but 'the violent carry it off'; for this alone is good violence, to force <sup>3</sup> God, and carry off life from God. But He, knowing those who lay claim violently, or rather, steadfastly, has given way to them; God delights in being worsted in such things. <sup>4</sup>

**Hippolytus**, Daniel, Book IV. 33. The Lord has come as the fulfilment <sup>5</sup> of the Law and the Prophets.

**Tertullian**, Against the Jews, viii. Christ being baptized, that is, sanctifying water by His baptism, the whole fulness of spiritual gifts withdrew into Christ, as He sealed visions and all prophecies, which He fulfilled by His Advent.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies, i. 9. Heading 'The former Law given by Moses was to come to an end.'

v. 14. **Hippolytus**, Haer. viii. 10 (3). *Docetae* quote this as a proof of transmigration of souls before the Lord's coming.

**Tertullian**, Soul, 35. Tertullian expects the heretics to

<sup>1</sup> ἐκβιάζεσθαι.

<sup>2</sup> βιαζόμεθα.

<sup>3</sup> βιάσασθαι.

<sup>4</sup> βιαίως . . . βεβαίως.

<sup>5</sup> πλήρωμα.

appeal to xi. 14, and xvii. 12 (*q. v.*) as proving transmigration of souls. But metempsychosis is the recall of a soul which has already undergone death and passed into another body ; but Elijah is to come not after death but after translation ; to be restored not to the body of which he had not been deprived, but to the world. . . . How John is Elijah is shown Luke i. 17 ; in power and spirit, not in soul and flesh.

Origen, Matthew, Book VII. (Frag. in Pamphilus' Apology), 441-2. Some have thought from this passage that the soul of Elijah was the same as that of John. They take 'This is Elijah' to refer to the soul, and from this passage alone infer a doctrine of *μετενσωμάτωσις*, that is of a transference of souls, as if Jesus Himself confirms this. But if this were true, something like it ought to be found in many writings of prophets and Gospels. The ensuing words 'He that hath ears to hear' . . . point to some secret meaning, not simply literal. Further, if, as they hold, transference of souls takes place on account of sins, because of what sins was the soul of Elijah transferred into John, who was foretold as about to be born by the very angel by whom our Saviour Jesus was also foretold ? Hence it is evidently false that he who was so perfect as not to taste the death which is common to men, should come to transference of soul which according to their statement can happen only as the effect of sins. Then how do they explain John i. 21 ? But that this may be shown to agree with the Lord's word, Matt. xi. 14, the words 'This is Elijah' must refer to the spirit and power of Elijah in which John went before to turn the hearts of the fathers to their sons.

John, Tome ii. 30 (24), p. 82. (One of several passages suggesting John's pre-existence.)

37 (30), p. 91. The witness of John extends also to the second and more divine Advent of Christ.

VI. 20 (12), p. 121. Heracleon (see on John i. 21).

*v.* 15. Clement, Strom. V. i. 2, 1. That believing he may understand what He says as He says it. Faith is the ears of the soul.

VI. xv. 115, 6. He means that it does not belong to all to hear and to understand.

Origen, Celsus, vii. 34, p. 718. Any one understands that these things are said of diviner ears (not natural ones).

VII. 43, p. 725. 'Hear' = 'understand.'

*vv.* 16-17. Origen in loc. (Cramer). That is, we have delivered to you teachings of gladness and of the kingdom of heaven, and you did not receive them with joy; and again, we threatened you with gloomy things and punishment, and you did not repent of your own sins.

(Possinus.) Those deliberately opposing the truth are convicted of evil doing, for they are not able to overthrow the truth by true words or testimonies. Attempting to do so they fall into their own nets.

*v.* 18, cp. Matt. xxi. 23f. Origen, John, Tome vi. 29 (14), p. 130. How is this consistent with all Jerusalem and all Judæa and all the circuit of Jordan being baptized by John?

Answer: The Pharisees, who were addressed as 'Brood of Vipers' come to his baptism without having believed him, perhaps because fearing the multitude and asking to be washed in dissimulation towards them, that they might seem not to oppose such things; cp. Luke xx. 6. What is said by the Saviour to the Pharisees is not opposed to what is written in the Gospels about the number of those baptized by John.

v. 19. **Clement**, Paed. II. ii. 32, 2f. (Against the Encratites.) The Lord drank wine when a man on earth, but moderately and reasonably. He blessed the wine, saying Matt. xxvi. 26-8 ; v. 29, ' this fruit of the vine ' shows that it was wine that was blessed. That it was wine that was drunk by the Lord is shown by what He says about Himself rebuking the hard-heartedness of the Jews, Matt. xi. 19.

**Origen**, Galatians (Apology of Pamphilus), p. 690. The Lord is frequently invited to meals and eats and drinks in the sight of all. He does so not deceiving or cheating the eyes of the beholders, nor as some think in an imaginary way, especially since He so took food and drink as to be charged by some, by exceeding audacity, of being too desirous of food and drink. But if any one wants in a still more forced manner to declare that these things were said because He ate in appearance and they did not know how it was ; we must reply to this from the Lord's own words, Matt. xi. 28-9. . . . . When the Saviour Himself says ' The Son of Man came eating and drinking,' how dare any one say that He neither ate nor drank ? This is sheer unbelief in His teaching.

v. 19-end. Luke vii. 35. **Irenæus**, I. i. 17, H. ; I. viii. 4, p. 40, M. The *Valentinians* find Achamoth referred to by the Saviour.

**Origen**, Jeremiah, Hom. xiv. 5, p. 211. Some interpret Jer. xv. 10, as referring to the Wisdom of God who brought forth the Prophets. The children of wisdom are recorded also in the Gospel, ' And wisdom sendeth forth <sup>1</sup> her children.' [Is this passage in view ? Ropes supposes combination of Luke xi. 49, and Prov. ix. 3.]

<sup>1</sup> ἀποστέλλει.



Matthew in loc. (Possinus). Christ, the Wisdom of God, was justified 'by her children,' i.e. believers, as being saved by Him ; and by the destruction of those who perish, as having said and done and taught all things even though they did not accept.

John, Tome ii. 1, p. 48. The saint is, because of his profit from wisdom, called a child of wisdom ; for wisdom, He says, is justified from her children.

## XLV

### LUKE vii. 36-50

**Clement**, Paed. II. viii. 61-3 (Against ointment). The woman, not yet partaking of the word, for she was still a sinner, honoured the Master with what she thought the finest thing she had, viz. the ointment, yea, with the adornment of her body, her own hairs, she wiped off the superfluity of the ointment, pouring upon the Lord tears of repentance.

Wherefore, 'her sins are forgiven her.' This may be a symbol of the Lord's teaching and of His Passion ; the feet anointed with fragrant ointment figure the divine teaching travelling with glory to the ends of the earth. . . . The Lord's feet which are anointed are the apostles by prophecy partaking of the fragrance of the unction of the Holy Spirit. . . . Tears are repentance ; and the loosed hairs proclaimed release from love of the world and patient endurance of affliction after (receiving) the preaching for the Lord's sake. Also the Passion is signified. The oil is the Lord Himself, from whom is the mercy upon us ; but the ointment, adulterated <sup>1</sup> oil, is Judas the traitor by whom the

<sup>1</sup> δεδολωμένον.

Lord's feet were anointed on His departing from life in the world, for the dead are anointed; tears are we sinners who have repented, who have believed on Him who has forgiven our sins, and the loosened hairs are mourning Jerusalem, the forsaken.

**Tertullian**, *Against Marcion*, iv. 18. When the sinful woman pressed with kisses the Lord's feet, flooded them with her tears, wiped with hairs and anointed with ointment, she handled the truth of a solid body, not an empty phantom. And the penitence of the sinner won pardon (mercy) according to the Creator, who is wont to prefer this to sacrifice. But even if the impulse to penitence had come from faith, she, being justified through penitence, arising from faith, heard 'Thy faith hath saved thee'; from the Creator who had pronounced through Habbakuk, 'The just shall live by his faith.'

**Chastity**, xi. He allowed to a sinful woman contact with His body, washing His feet with her tears and wiping them with her hairs and inaugurating his burial with ointment. (Pardon bestowed by the Lord personally upon Jewish sinners has no bearing upon Christian discipline.)

**Origen**, *Leviticus*, Hom. i. 4, p. 186. There is a progress between (1) touching the hem of His garment; (2) washing His feet with tears, and wiping with hairs of head; (3) better, to have anointed His head with ointment; (4) best, to have lain on His breast.

(This implies distinction of Luke vii from John xii.)

**Canticles**, Hom. i. 4, p. 14. In the Gospel a sinner taking an alabaster box of precious spikenard ointment, poured it on Jesus' head and feet. Notice carefully which of the two women poured it on the Saviour's *head*; the sinner is shown to have poured it on His feet,

and she who is said not to have been a sinner, on His head. (The Gospels comprise not stories and narratives, but mysteries.)

Matthew, Book XII. 4, p. 517. Henceforth no longer committing fornication but coming to Jesus' feet and washing them with the tears of repentance, and anointing them with the fragrance of the ointment of a holy life ; on whose account He spoke reproachfully to Simon the *leper*, the former people.

§ 8 (Latin), p. 834. The sinful woman repenting was at Jesus' feet at the beginning of her repentance ; for she could not pour on the head of Christ the ointment of the odour of her good works. For it was a desirable thing with her even to stand beside the Lord's feet and anoint them.

Luke (Mai, Gallandi, Corderius). The more perfect soul which has well served the Word of God, has confidence to come to the very head, but ' the head of Christ is God,' so as to pour ointment on it and to have produced fragrance to the glory of God ; for God is glorified through the fragrance of the life of the righteous. But the more imperfect woman and soul is engaged at the feet and humble things, nigh to which are we. For we have not repented from our sins. Where are our tears ? Where our weeping ? that we may be able to come even to the feet of Jesus. For not yet can we come to His very head. It is sufficient<sup>1</sup> after our sins to bring a fragrance of repentance, that any may be able to be the second one, she who anoints His feet, not His head—that is, she who does not handle the more perfect and high things, but the extreme and last.

<sup>1</sup> ἀγαπητόν = desirable.

John (Frag. 78, on John xi. 2). It is clear that Mary is the same as she who in Luke anointed the Lord with ointment. He concealed her name ; John supplied what he lacked. But who would not be led by such witness of Jesus concerning Mary, to come, not despairing because of his past, and sit at Jesus' feet, and be His disciple ? For, Luke vii. 37f.

(Cyprian), To Novatian, xi. The Lord forgives sins and receives the penitent. . . . The Lord of His bountiful kindness remits their debt to both debtors. See Him forgiving sins, see the sinful woman repenting, weeping, entreating and receiving forgiveness of sins.

(In the quotation '*Petrus*' is regularly substituted for '*Simon*', vv. 40, 43, 47.)

v. 40f. Origen, Leviticus, Hom. ii. 4, p. 191. There is remission of sins through abundance of love ; cp. 1 Peter iv. 8.

Numbers, Hom. xxv. 4, p. 368. Scripture declares the numbers 500 and 50 to be holy.  $7 \times 7$  plus 1 = 50 = Pentecost.  $70 \times 7$  plus 10 (perfection) = 500. But as seventy sevens are more than seven, so 500 is a more excellent and perfect number than 50. So our Saviour in the parable declares that he to whom the debt of 500 denarii was forgiven loves more than he who was forgiven 50.

Ps. xxxviii (ix) Hom. ii. 4, p. 697. The amount of forgiveness is regulated by the degree of penitence, lest we deceive ourselves by thinking these things dispensed by no rules or judgments.

Jeremiah, Hom. xv. 5, p. 225. The two debtors are those who have believed in God from two peoples. The people coming from the Jews, disbelieving in Christ, owes the 50 pence ; perhaps we from the Gentiles, who have of old been more ungodly, owe the 500, in whose



case also is said what was said to that penitent harlot ; the context shows that the ' 500 ' relates to her.

Matthew, Book XIV. 7, p. 624. The two debtors, one of 500 denarii, the other of 50, either having been entrusted with these and having administered them badly, being inferior in ability to the man entrusted with the talent—or we have not learnt that they had received, but seem taught by the parable that they owed so much.

§ 77 (Latin), p. 893. Luke does not say that Simon was a leper. I think he was the debtor who owed 50 denarii and had already received their remission because he loved little ; yet loving a little he asked Jesus to eat with him. (Origen here distinguishes carefully from the anointing (s) recorded by the other evangelists.)

Romans, Book IV. 1, p. 523. ' Debts ' mean sins. Eph. i. 8 (Cramer : J. Th. St. iii. 238). He who understands the meaning of ' By grace ye are saved and not by works ', and compares transgressions with transgressions, would see according to the parable about the 500 and the 50 denarii, who it is who ought to render more thanks to the householder who forgave the debt.

Cyprian, Testimonies, iii. 116. Heading ' God is loved more by him to whom more sins are forgiven in baptism.'

vv. 48–50. Tertullian, Prescription of Heretics, xiv. ' Thy *faith* hath saved thee '—not skill in the Scriptures.

Origen, Rom. iii. 28 (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. xiii. 222). Proof that the law of faith suffices altogether for justification, without our having wrought anything. . . . As the result of no work, but of faith, are her sins forgiven her and she heard the message ' Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace.'

(In the sequel Origen implies that works before faith do not justify.)

Romans, Book III. 9, p. 517. From no work of law, but for faith alone, He says to her 'Thy sins are forgiven thee', and again 'Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace.' Also in many Gospel passages we find the Saviour declaring the faith of a believer the cause of his healing (salvation).

(Cyprian), Rebaptism, xviii. Hearts are cleansed by faith; souls washed by the Spirit.

## XLVI

## LUKE viii. 1-3

Tertullian, Against Marcion, iv. 19. That rich women adhered to Christ, and also ministered to Him from their resources, among whom was the wife of the King's steward, is according to prophecy, Isa. xxxii. 9. 'Hear my voice', first as disciples, then as workers and assistants<sup>1</sup> . . . 'with labour in hope.' (Old Latin.)

## XLVII

MATT. xii. 22-37; MARK iii. 19-30;  
(LUKE xi. 17-23; vi. 43-5)

Origen, Celsus, II. ix, p. 394. He displayed Himself among the Jews as the Power of God, through the wonders which He wrought, which are suspected by Celsus to have been done by jugglery; but by the Jews of the time, who had learnt about Beelzebub (Beelzeboul) from some source or other, He was supposed to cast out the demons in Beelzebub, prince of the demons. Our Saviour convicted them of speaking most unreasonably,

<sup>1</sup> Ministras.

by the kingdom of evil not yet having an end ; as will be clear to those who intelligently read the Gospel story.

VIII. 25, p. 761. Celsus declares that the daemons belong to God (τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσίν). Origen denies this; 'their prince is not God, but, as the divine words say, Beelzebub'.

Numbers, Hom. xiii. 5, p. 320. Those who invoke Beelzebub are magicians. This was known to those people, and therefore they said, speaking falsely against my Lord Jesus, 'He casts out daemons in Beelzebub, prince of the demons.' But the Saviour, knowing it indeed to be true that Beelzebub is prince of the daemons, did not charge them with falsehood on this point, but replies, 'If I in Beelzebub cast out daemons, in whom do your sons cast them out?'

John, Tome xix. 15, 4, p. 297. They had certainly learnt something about daemons and their prince, whose name is Beelzebub (1) ; but these things are not contained at all in the current books. And the Saviour's words, v. 27, attest that Beelzebub is not fictitious ; He says this accepting the real existence of Beelzebub, and that he who casts out daemons in him effects some division of Satan against himself. They were then mistaken in saying that in Beelzebub devils were being cast out by the Saviour ; but they had comprehended that there was a Beelzebub, prince of the daemons. (Thus we have here an instance of recondite tradition.)

v. 25. Ptolemaeus, To Flora, i. 5. (Epiphanius, Haer. xxxiii. 3, p. 217.) The Law cannot be ascribed to the unrighteousness of the adversary, for it puts down unrighteousness.

Irenæus V. xxvi. 1, p. 324, M., on Apoc. xvii. 12-14. Since the kingdom must be divided and so perish, the Lord says Matt. xii. 25. So both kingdom and city and

house must be divided into ten ; therefore He already foreshadowed the partitioning and division.

**Clementine Recognitions**, ii. 35. He divides by the word of truth the kingdom of the world which lies in error, or every house in it, that error may fall and truth reign.

v. 26. **Clementine Homilies**, xix. 2. (A passage proving the personal existence of the Evil One.)

v. 28. **Origen**, Matthew in loc. (Possinus). If you believe, the kingdom of God has come upon you ; if not, you will be delivered to destruction.

**Eusebius**, Gospel Demonstration, iii. 2, p. 93, compares, for Luke's phrase ' finger of God ', Exod. viii. 19 , xxxi. 18.

v. 29. **Irenæus**, III. viii. 2, p. 183, M. When He called the devil ' the Strong ', it was not absolutely, but compared with ourselves ; the Lord showed Himself truly strong for all things, saying v. 29. We were his goods (instruments) and his house, when we were in rebellion, for he used us as he would, and an unclean spirit dwelt in us. For he had not strength against Him who bound him and spoiled his house, but against those men who were in his control, since he had made their mind depart from God ; these the Lord rescued according to Jer. xxxi. 11. If then He had not mentioned Him who binds and spoils his goods, but had merely said that he was strong, the Strong one would be unconquered. But He mentioned also One who lays hold ; he who binds holds, he who is bound is held. And this He did without a comparison, that the rebel servant might not be compared to the Lord.

V. xxi. 3, p. 319, M. Since the rebel angel . . . originally persuaded man to transgress the command of His Maker, he consequently held him in his power ; now his power is transgression and rebellion, and with these he bound men ; it was right that through man himself he being



conquered should be bound in his turn with the same chains with which he bound man, that man being loosed might return to his Lord, leaving those chains with which he had been bound, viz. transgression. For his binding constitutes man's loosing, *v.* 29.

See also Armenian fragment (10), (T. U. xxxvi. 3.)

**Hippolytus**, *Heads against Gaius*, vii. Gaius opposes Apoc. xx. 2-3, on the ground that Satan is already bound, Matt. xii. 29. Hippolytus asks, 'If this be so, how can he tempt believers, or pursue and spoil men? Why did the Lord teach us to pray to be delivered from the evil one?' (and quotes other Scripture passages). The meaning of 'He bound the Strong one' is that He convicted and put to shame those who did not come to Him when He opposed the devil in order to cleanse them from his influence and make them children of His Father. This appears from the following words, *v.* 30.

**Origen**, *Numbers*, Hom. vii. 5, 292. Though the 'Strong One' has already because of his pride been cast out from his heavenly house, yet unless you overcome him, you will not enter into the 'Strong One's' house. And he must be not only overcome but also bound. For unless he be bound, our journey cannot be safe.

**Joshua**, Hom. xiv. 2, p. 430. The strong man sleeps securely in his own court, until a stronger comes to bind him and carry off his possessions. The king of the court is the prince of this world. Cp. Hom. xv. 2, p. 433.

**Matthew** in loc. (Cramer). (1) The 'strong man' is sin; his house, the body, the old man.

(2) The strong man's house is the earthly sphere; the strong man is the devil; the strong man's goods (instruments) are those who are led astray by his will.

(3) Unless the opposing power of the 'Strong one', I mean, of the devil, pass over and bind the godly and

strong reasoning of the mind, it cannot hurt the virtues of the soul and destroy with it its yokefellow, the body.

Romans, Book V. 10, p. 567. Christ having bound the Strong one and triumphed over him on His cross, proceeded also to his house, the house of death, the world below, and then spoiled his goods, i.e. carried off the souls he was holding.

Cp. also Exodus, Hom. xi. 3, p. 169.

Adamantius, iii: 7, p. 836. Megethius quotes this to show that the two substances, light and darkness, are not of equal strength. The verse shows that Christ bound the devil, being stronger than he, and took his goods. The Lord showed clearly that He rescued us who belonged to the Evil One.

Adamantius replies that this might be so if He had said simply 'of the Evil One' and not 'instruments' (goods) of the Evil One, showing that he had them in use, and they were his not by his being their maker or owner, but only by use, he taking by force what was another's.

Eusebius, Ps. cxlix. 8. It was not otherwise possible to withdraw and set free those who had previously been enslaved to daemons, except by subjecting and binding their rulers. The opposing powers were bound by the prayers of the apostles, and their words teaching and corresponding life, and their acts wrought against daemons.

Hegemonius, 18 (16). That which is conquered has destruction nigh at hand. For what does the divine Word say? 'For who can enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, unless he be stronger than he?'

v. 30. Luke. Origen, Matthew, Book XVII. 14, p. 789. Not 'for Him' are the heretics, who affect to

glorify Him and so confound Father and Son, or speak evil of the Creator. They are not with Him and so are against Him ; they scatter rather than gather. He does not say simply ' He that gathereth not, scattereth ', but adds precisely ' with Me ' ; for he who gathers must gather with Him. You will understand from 1 Cor. v. 4f who they are who gather with Him. It will not suit those who gather or are gathered together with evil life, or together with evil and impious views about God and Christ.

Psalm cxlvi (vii) 2, p. 844. Those whom wickedness scatters virtue gathers. So also the Lord says in the Gospels, ' And he that gathereth not with Me, scattereth.'

Cyprian, Testimonies iii. 86. Heading, ' Schism must not be made, even though he who secedes continue in the one faith and the same tradition.'

Unity, 6. He who breaks Christ's peace and concord is acting against Christ ; he who gathers elsewhere than the Church scatters the Church of Christ.

Epistles lxix. 1. Our Lord Jesus Christ, when testifying in His Gospel that those who were not with Him were His enemies, did not point out any form of heresy, but showed all without exception to be adversaries who were not with Him, and not gathering with Him were scattering His flock.

lxx. 3. (Against validity of heretic and schismatic baptism.) What act done by those whom the Lord calls in His Gospel His own enemies and adversaries, can be valid and sure with the Lord ?

lxxv. 14. Christ our Lord says this, manifesting that His Spouse is one and declaring the mystery of her unity. For if Christ is with us, but the heretics are not with us, assuredly the heretics are against Christ ; and if

we gather with Christ but the heretics gather not with us, there is no doubt but that they scatter.

Judgments of the Bishops, 11—*Secundinus* of Cédias. Since our Lord Christ says 'He that is not with Me is against Me', and the Apostle John gives the name of antichrists to those who go forth from the Church, assuredly the enemies of Christ and those who are called antichrists cannot minister the grace of saving baptism.

24. *Secundinus* of Carpos. Are heretics Christians or not? If they are Christians, why are they not in the Church of God? If they are not Christians, let them become so. Or what is the point of our Lord's saying, Matt. xii. 30?

*Didascalia*, 11. Thou art then no fellow-worker with God in gathering the people, as thou art one who disturbs and scatters the flock, an opponent and enemy of God.

13. (Applied to a man who drops church-going.) As you are members of Christ, you should not scatter yourselves from the church, by not coming together. Do not dismember or scatter the Body of our Saviour, of Whom you are members.

v. 31f. *Theodotus* in *Epiphanius*, Haer. liv. 2, p. 464, says that he has committed no sin in having denied Christ, since Christ Himself says 'Every blasphemy shall be forgiven to men, and he who saith a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him.'

*Origen*, First Principles, I. iii. 2, p. 61. Who will not be astonished at the greatness of the dignity of the Holy Spirit, when he hears that he who has spoken a word against the Son of Man may venture to hope for pardon, but he who has blasphemed against the Holy Spirit has no pardon either in the present world or in the future?



I. iii. 7, p. 63. Only the saints participate in the Holy Spirit. . . . Hence he who has sinned against the Son of Man is worthy of pardon, because he who is a partaker of the Word (Reason), if he cease to live rationally, seems to have fallen into ignorance or folly, and therefore to deserve pardon; but he who has already been counted worthy to partake of the Holy Spirit, and has turned back, is said by this very fact and deed to have blasphemed against the Holy Spirit.

John, Tome ii. 10 (6)f, p. 61f. How is the spirit apparently honoured above Christ in some Scriptures? Isa. xlviii. 16, and the passage in the Gospel where Christ promises forgiveness in the case of sin against Himself, but declares of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit that not only in this world (age) will there be no forgiveness to him who has blasphemed against Him, but also not in the world to come. But it may certainly be that it is not because the Holy Spirit is more honourable than Christ that there is no remission to him who has sinned against Him; but because all rational things partake of Christ, and pardon is granted to them on turning from their sins; while it is reasonable that those men who have been counted worthy of the Holy Spirit should obtain no pardon along with an agreement<sup>1</sup> of such extent and character with those who are still falling away to evil and turning aside from the counsels of the indwelling Spirit.

XIX. 14 (3), p. 296. I know that some are held by their own sin not only in this age but also in that to come, as those of whom this verse speaks; nevertheless if not in the age to come, it does not straightway follow that he will have no forgiveness in the ages which are coming on.

<sup>1</sup> *συμπνοίας*.

XXVIII. 15 (13), p. 388. Perhaps it is because those who sin after receiving the Holy Spirit may not obtain forgiveness, it is said of those who have sinned before receiving the Holy Spirit, 'Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven to the sons of men ;' but of those who have stumbled after receiving the Holy Spirit, 'He that hath blasphemed against the Holy Spirit hath not forgiveness either in this age or in that to come.' For he who sins when He is present in the soul blasphemes by deeds and words of sin against the present Holy Spirit. Cp. Heb. vi. 4f.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies iii. 28. Heading, 'That there cannot be forgiveness in the Church for him who has sinned against God.'

Epistle xvi. 2. That the sin which persecution has forced to be committed is the highest of all, is known even to those who have committed it, since our Lord and Judge has said Matt. x. 32-3 ; Mark iii. 28-9.

(**Cyprian**) Diceplayers, 10. Since for sin against God there arises no excuse nor indulgence, and pardon is granted to none, the Lord says in the Gospel Matt. xii. 32 ; also 1 Sam. ii. 25 ; 1 Cor. iii. 16 ; Matt. vii. 23 ; 1 John v. 18.

**Theognostus**, Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. (Frag. in Athanasius to Sarapion.) As the Saviour converses with those who cannot yet bear <sup>1</sup> what is perfect, condescending to their littleness, but with those who are being perfected the Holy Spirit associates ; and no one would, I suppose, say from this that the instruction of the Spirit surpasses the teaching of the Son, but that the Son condescends to the imperfect, while the Spirit is the seal of those who are being perfected ; so it is

<sup>1</sup> *χωρεῖν*.

not because of superiority of the Spirit over the Son that the blasphemy against the Spirit allows of no escape or pardon, but because there is pardon in the case of the imperfect, while in the case of those who have tasted the heavenly gift and have been perfected there remains no defence or excuse procuring pardon.

**Didascalia**, 25. There are some against whom our Lord has expressed a hard and inexorable sentence of judgement. 'It will never be forgiven them, neither in this world nor that to come.' As regards the people who had not believed in Christ and who laid hands upon the Son of Man with reviling, He said, 'It may be forgiven them'; and at another time, Luke xxiii. 34. The heathen blaspheme the Son of Man on account of the Cross, but forgiveness extends to them. (For these can receive forgiveness of their evil deeds by baptism, as the Lord has said, Matt. xii. 31f.) Those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost are those who blaspheme Almighty God by hypocrisy; heretics who do not receive His holy books, or receive them in hypocrisy and blasphemy; those who blaspheme the Catholic Church which contains the Holy Spirit. They have already been condemned by Christ, 'It shall never be forgiven them.'

**Hegemonius**, xxxv (xxxi). Our Saviour granted pardon even if any had offered despite (*injuriā*) to the Son of Man. But if he offered despite to the Holy Spirit, He subjected him to two curses, viz. that of the Law of Moses, in the present time, and that of His own law in the time of the Judgment; for He says 'Neither in this world nor in that to come shall it be forgiven him.' It is the Law of Moses that bestows forgiveness on none in the present world; the Law of Christ punishes in the world to come.



v. 33. **Ignatius**, Ephesians, 14. The tree is known from its fruit. So those who profess to be Christ's will be seen through what they do. For the work is not one of present profession, but (is seen) if one be found in the power of faith unto the end.

**Clement**, Strom. III. v. 44, 1. Known from its fruits, not from its flowers and leaves (i.e. words).

**Origen**, First Principles, II. v. 4, p. 89. 'Good and evil' are 'genera'—embracing specific virtues and vices. He shows that in the good man are both justice, temperance, prudence, piety and everything which can either be called or understood to be good. So the 'evil man' would be both unjust and impure and impious, and all things which individually deform the evil man; for as without these wickednesses no one thinks any one to be an evil man, nor can he be evil, so without these virtues it is certain that no one will be thought good. (Origen is arguing that 'just' is not opposed to 'good', but included in it.)

**Matthew** in loc. (Cramer). The good tree is the Holy Spirit; the corrupt tree is the unclean spirit, or the devil. Therefore produce worthy fruits, that you may make the Holy Spirit dwell in yourselves, and not such that the evil tree may come to you.

**Romans**, Book VI. 5, p. 574. The choice and will of man is here called a tree, either good or evil; and works, its fruit.

VIII. 11, p. 637. Showing that a tree is not born good or evil, but is made so.

**Cyprian**, Epistle lix. 3. Every one is at once betrayed by his mouth and his words, and is detected by his speaking whether he has Christ in his heart, or in truth antichrist.

vv. 36-7. **Irenæus**, II. xxviii. H.; II. xix. 1, p. 142, M.



All, whosoever they are, who put idle words in the ears of men, will stand in the judgement to give account of their vain guesses and lies against God.

**Clement**, Paed. II. vi. 50, 2. Spoken of one who speaks foolishness, <sup>1</sup> as Eph. v. 3.

**Origen**, Exhortation to Martyrdom, vii, p. 279. What is so idle a word as an oath in denial?

Ps. xxxviii (xxxix), Hom. i. 3, p. 291. Not only of what you have spoken ill, but of what you have spoken idly; for an evil word is not idle, for it works an evil work. But an idle word is that which does nothing, either good or evil.

**Jeremiah**, Hom. xxxix, Frag. p. 286 (Philocalia, x. 1). If we have received commandment to speak no idle word, since we shall give account for it in the day of judgement, and we make it our aim as far as possible to make every word that goes forth from our mouth do work both in us who speak and in those who hear; we must suppose that every word spoken by the mouth of the prophets was operative.

**Ezekiel**, Hom. ii. 3, p. 363. Spoken as to a man all whose words are not such as to justify him, nor all such as to condemn him. If any one is pure from words which are strange and blameable, he will by his words be justified and not condemned. But if he has never spoken aright but has always uttered perverse things, he will by his words be condemned and not justified. But because we who are not in all respects perfect, nor so speak as to be always justified, nor are, on the other hand, such sinners as to be always condemned, have some words by which to be justified, and some by which to be condemned; God puts both sides in His balance

<sup>1</sup> μωρολογῶν.

and weighs carefully, and judges in what words I am just and in what to be condemned.

**Tertullian**, *Against Marcion*, ii. 25. (Applied to confession or denial of our sins.)

**Cyprian**, *Testimonies*, iii. 13. (Ascribed to *Luke*.)  
Against evil speaking.

**Eusebius**, *Gospel Preparation*, I. iv. p. 12. (We are taught) to be scrupulous not to utter any falsehood or abuse, or anything foul or unseemly, because of this exhortation.

### XLVIII

MATT. xii. 46-50 ; MARK iii. 31-5 ;  
LUKE viii. 19-21

**Epiphanius**, *Haer.* xxx. 14, p. 139. The Ebionites maintain that this shows that Christ was not a man.

**Hippolytus**, *Blessings of Moses*, x—on Deut. xxxiii. 9. (T. U. 26) He teaches us to forsake parents and brethren according to the flesh, and to follow the heavenly Father, that we may be sons of God. . . He did not know as His brothers those who were in bodily fashion held to be His brothers ; the Redeemer did not know them, because in truth those who were begotten of Joseph were not His brothers, but He was of the Virgin and the Holy Spirit. They were held to be His brothers, but He did not recognize them.

**Tertullian**, *Flesh of Christ*, 7. Apelles, Marcion, and all who reject Christ's real birth, declare that God Himself denies having been born, because He said 'Who is my mother and who are my brethren?' Tertullian replies that in the first place no one would ever have announced that His mother and brothers were standing outside, who was not sure that He had a

mother and brothers, and that he was announcing these very persons, either previously known to him or now just made known; even though the heretics have purposely removed from the Gospel that those who were astonished at His teaching said that His reputed father Joseph the carpenter and His mother Mary and His brothers and sisters were well known to them. 'But they announced to Him a mother and brothers whom He had not, in order to tempt Him.' But Scripture does not say so, though elsewhere it does not conceal when anything was done in order to tempt Him, Luke x. 25, etc. Besides in what did the temptation consist? What did they think should be tested in Him? Whether He had been born or not? But every temptation must start from some preceding question which by inducing doubt may impose temptation. But Christ's Birth was not in question; and if He was to be tempted about this, it would not have been in this fashion. . . . We are all born, and yet not all of us have brothers or mother. . . . It is more likely that they being sure that He had a mother and brothers, made an attempt upon (temptaverint) His Divinity rather than His Birth, trying whether He being inside knew what was outside, by falsely announcing the presence of those who were not really present. But even so the temptation might have failed. He might have known that those whom they announced were really absent, on the grounds of health or business, or travelling. . . . The idea of temptation thus falls to the ground, and the simple announcement remains that His mother and brothers had truly come. But let Apelles learn the point of the reply denying at the time His mother and brothers. The Lord's brothers had not believed on Him. . . . His mother likewise is not shown to have adhered to Him like Martha and

Mary. In short, in this very passage their unbelief appears; while Jesus was teaching the way of life, preaching the kingdom of God, labouring in healing sicknesses and defects, strangers attended to Him, but His relatives were absent. At last they come up and stand outside, not coming in, presumably not taking account of what was going on inside, nor do they at least wait, (but) as if they were bringing something more urgent than what He was specially engaged in, rather interrupt and want Him summoned from so great a work. Would not you, Apelles or Marcion, if called off from (some amusement) by such a message, have said, 'Who is my mother, or who are my brothers'? Was Christ, preaching and commending God, fulfilling Law and Prophets, dispersing the darkness of long ages, unjustified in speaking thus to smite the unbelief of those who were standing outside, or to shake off the importunity of those who were calling Him away from His work? . . . When indignation denies relatives,<sup>1</sup> it does not deny but reproaches. Lastly, He made others superior, and by showing what deserves preference, viz. the hearing of the word, He proved in what way it was that He denied His mother and brothers. For in the same way as He adopted others who were adhering to Him, He likewise denied those who were standing aloof from Him. Furthermore, Christ is wont to perform fully what He teaches others. How then would it have been if, while teaching not to regard father or mother or brothers so highly as the word of God, He Himself should forsake the word of God when His mother and brothers were announced? So He denied His relatives<sup>2</sup> just as He taught they should be denied, in comparison of God's

<sup>1</sup> Parentes.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*



work. But besides, the mother dissociated is a figure of the synagogue ; and the unbelieving brothers, a figure of the Jews. In them, Israel was outside ; but the new disciples inside, hearing and believing and cleaving to Christ, denoted the Church.

Against Marcion, iv. 19. We come to the most constant argument of all those who dispute the Lord's birth. He Himself, they say, testifies that He has not been born, by saying ' Who is my mother or my brothers ? ' . . . We say in reply, first, that it could not have been announced to Him that His mother and brothers were standing outside, seeking to see Him, if He had had no mother and no brothers certainly known to the man who announced them, either previously known or just made known at the time of their desiring to see Him, or themselves entrusting him with the message. In reply to this they ask, ' What if the message was in order to tempt ? ' But Scripture does not say so, as it does Luke x. 25 ; xx. 20 ; so that where it makes no mention of temptation, it does not allow the interpretation of temptation. Yet *ex abundanti*, I ask for motives for temptation. If it was to know whether He had been born or not, when had there been question of this ? Who had any doubt of the birth of one whom he saw to be man, whom he heard professing Himself Son of Man, whom, from beholding in Him every human quality, he hesitated to believe to be God or the Son of God ? more readily regarding Him as a prophet, a great one certainly, yet born. Even though He were to have been tempted by searching out His birth, any other argument would have been more suitable than this. . . . Do all who are born have a mother surviving, or brothers ? May they not rather have fathers and sisters, or indeed no one ? But it is also established that a census was

taken under Augustus in Judaea by Sentius Saturninus, in which they could have looked up His family.<sup>1</sup> Therefore the idea of temptation falls to the ground and His mother and brothers were really standing outside. It remains to consider His meaning. . . . He was justly indignant that such near relatives were standing outside, while strangers inside were intent on His words ; and further were seeking to summon Him away from His important work. He did not so much deny as reject. And therefore, after having first said, 'Who is my mother and who are my brothers ?' by adding 'except those who hear my words and do them.' He transferred the names of blood-relationship to others whom He judged to be nearer by faith. But no one transfers anything except from him who has what he transfers. If then He made them to be His mother and brothers, who were not such, how did He deny those who were ? On the ground of their deservings . . . teaching in His own case that he who preferred father or mother or brothers to the word of God was no worthy disciple. He rather acknowledged His mother and brothers by being unwilling to recognize them. In adopting others, He was establishing those whom He denied because of their stumbling ; He substituted others for them not as more true but as more worthy. Finally it is no great thing if He preferred faith to blood-relationship, which He had not.

**Origen.** Matthew in loc. (Cramer). Those who know not the mystery of the Virgin say to Jesus, 'Thy brothers' ; for if they knew they would believe in Him. But any one becomes brother or sister or mother of Jesus by doing the will of the Father in heaven. But if

<sup>1</sup> Genus.

any one is not by nature brother to Him, or any of the rest ; every virgin and uncorrupt soul, conceiving by the Holy Spirit that it may bring forth the Father's will, is mother of Jesus.

Kinship according to God is to be preferred to that according to the flesh, for it both excels and abides.

§ 9 (Latin), p. 835. He was speaking what just precedes this to the multitudes. . . . No longer stretching out His hand over the multitudes but over His disciples, He said, *vv.* 49-50.

John, Tome ii. 12 (6), p. 64. (How the Holy Spirit can be called the Mother of Jesus, as in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.) If he who does the will of the Father in heaven is His brother and sister and mother, and the name 'brother of Christ' extends not only to the human race but also to more divine beings, it will be nothing strange that the Holy Spirit is His mother beyond every one who is called mother of Christ because of doing the will of the Father in heaven.

Romans, Book IV. 6, p. 533. Who will be the mother of Jesus except one whose womb is dead, so that she bears sons of chastity, as the woman of whom the apostle speaks, 1 Tim. ii. 15.

Hegemonius, lv (xlvii). (*Manes* argues that the Lord here repudiates His supposed mother and brothers.) But if you mean to say that Mary was His mother, you will find it dangerous, for doubtless it will be also shown that He had also brothers by her. Tell us whether they were begotten by Joseph or by the same Holy Spirit? In the latter case, we have had many Christs. But if you maintain that He had brothers, though they were not of the same Spirit, it must doubtless be understood that after the Spirit, that after Gabriel, the most chaste Virgin and immaculate was married to Joseph. But if

this also is absurd, that she had in any way intercourse with Joseph, say whence had He brothers? Do you charge her with adultery? But if you cannot show that He had brothers, how will Mary be His mother? . . . (He blessed Peter when he called Him 'Son of the living God,' but reproved one who said 'Behold Thy mother and Thy brothers,' replying 'Who are my mother and my brothers?' . . .)

lvi. Archelaus replies that the Lord did not reprove this man as though mistaken. While our Lord was teaching and healing men, and the mind of all His hearers was intent on this, the messenger entering inopportunately mentioned His mother and brothers. Ought He to have left those whom he was teaching and healing, to talk with His mother and brothers? He had bidden His disciples to forsake father and mother, and said 'Let the dead bury their own dead' . . . . So now He does not allow of passing by His Father's commandment for the sake of His mother's presence.







PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE  
S. P. C. K.

---

BOOKS FOR  
STUDENTS  
AND  
OTHERS

---

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING  
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C. 2

43 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C. 4

BRIGHTON : 129 NORTH STREET. BATH : 39 GAY STREET

*New York and Toronto : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY*

*And of all Booksellers.*

## ***Translations of Early Documents***

A Series of texts important for the study of Christian origins. Under the Joint Editorship of the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., and the Rev. Canon G. H. Box, D.D.

### **FIRST SERIES—Palestinian-Jewish and Cognate Texts (Pre-Rabbinic)**

#### **Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra**

Translated from the Aramaic by A. E. COWLEY, Litt.D.  
Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.  
4s. 6d.

#### **The Wisdom of Ben-Sira (Ecclesiasticus)**

By the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., Vicar of St. Alban's, Bedford Park, W.; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. 3s. 6d.

#### **The Book of Enoch**

By the Rev. R. H. CHARLES, D.D., Canon of Westminster. 3s. 6d.

#### **The Book of Jubilees**

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. 4s. 6d.

#### **The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs**

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. 3s. 6d.

#### **The Ascension of Isaiah**

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. Together with *The Apocalypse of Abraham* in one volume. 4s. 6d.

#### **The Apocalypse of Ezra (ii. Esdras)**

By the Rev. Canon Box. 3s. 6d.

#### **The Apocalypse of Baruch**

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. Together with *The Assumption of Moses* in one volume. 3s. 6d.



*Translations of Early Documents (continued).*

**The Apocalypse of Abraham**

By the Rev. Canon Box. Together with *The Ascension of Isaiah* in one volume. 4s. 6d.

**The Assumption of Moses**

By Rev. W. J. FERRAR, M.A. Together with *The Apocalypse of Baruch* in one volume. 3s. 6d.

**The Biblical Antiquities of Philo**

By M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Litt.D., Dublin, Hon. LL.D., St. Andrews, Provost of King's College, Cambridge. 8s. 6d.

**The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament**

By M. R. JAMES, Litt.D. 5s. 6d.

**SECOND SERIES—Hellenistic-Jewish Texts**

**The Wisdom of Solomon**

By W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D. 3s. 6d.

**The Sibylline Oracles (Books iii-v)**

By the Rev. H. N. BATE, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. 3s. 6d.

**The Letter of Aristeas**

By H. ST. JOHN THACKERAY, M.A., King's College, Cambridge. 3s. 6d.

**Selections from Josephus**

By H. ST. J. THACKERAY, M.A. 5s.

**The Third and Fourth Books  
of Maccabees**

By the Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D. 3s. 6d.

**The Book of Joseph and Asenath**

Translated from the Greek by E. W. BROOKS. 3s. 6d.

*Translations of Early Documents (continued).*

**THIRD SERIES—Palestinian-Jewish and  
Cognate Texts (Rabbinic)**

**The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (Pirke  
Aboth).** Translated from the Hebrew by W. O. E.  
OESTERLEY, D.D. 5s.

**Tractate Berakoth (Benedictions).** With Intro-  
duction and Notes by A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D. 6s.

**Tractate Sanhedrin. Mishnah and Tosefta.**  
The Judicial procedure of the Jews as codified towards  
the end of the second century A.D. Translated from  
the Hebrew, with brief Annotations, by the Rev.  
HERBERT DANBY, M.A. 6s.

**Kimhi's Commentary on the Psalms**  
(Book I, Selections). By Rev. R. G. FINCH, B.D. 7s. 6d.

---

**Select Passages Illustrating Neoplatonism.**  
Translated with an Introduction by E. R. DODDS,  
University College, Reading. 5s.

**Jewish Literature and Christian Origins :**  
**A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical  
and Mediæval Judaism.** By W. O. E. OESTERLEY,  
M.A., D.D., and G. H. BOX, M.A., D.D. 12s. 6d.

**The Uncanonical Jewish Books**  
A Short Introduction to the Apocrypha and the Jewish  
Writings 200 B.C.—A.D. 100. By W. JOHN FERRAR,  
M.A. 2s. 6d.

**Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache**  
Being the Donnellan Lectures, 1920, by J. ARMITAGE  
ROBINSON, D.D., Dean of Wells. 6s.

**The Acts of the Apostles**  
Translated from the Codex Bezae, with an Introduction  
on its Lucan Origin and importance by Canon J. M.  
WILSON, D.D. 3s. 6d.

**Pistis Sophia**  
Literally Translated from the Coptic by GEORGE HORNER.  
With an Introduction by F. LEGGE, F.S.A. 16s.

# ***Translations of Christian Literature***

**A** NUMBER of translations from the Fathers have already been published by the S.P.C.K. under the title "Early Church Classics." It is now proposed to enlarge this series to include texts which are neither "early" nor necessarily "classics." The divisions at present proposed are given below. Volumes belonging to the original series are marked with an asterisk.

## **SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS.**

**Dionysius the Areopagite: The Divine Names and the Mystical Theology.** By C. E. ROLT. 7s. 6d.

**The Library of Photius.** By J. H. FREESE, M.A.  
Vol. I. 10s.

**The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes.** By T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 7s. 6d.

**\*The Epistle of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome.** By the Rt. Rev. J. A. F. GREGG, D.D. 1s. 9d. (*Out of print.*)

**\*Clement of Alexandria: Who is the Rich Man that is being saved?** By P. M. BARNARD, B.D. 1s. 9d.

**\*St. Chrysostom: On the Priesthood.** By T. A. MOXON. 2s. 6d.

**The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles.** By C. BIGG, D.D. Revised by the Right Rev. A. J. MACLEAN, D.D. 3s. 6d.

**\*The Epistle to Diognetus.** By the Rt. Rev. L. B. RADFORD, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**St. Dionysius of Alexandria.** By C. L. FELTOE, D.D. 4s.

**\*The Epistle of the Gallican Churches: Lugdunum and Vienna.** With an Appendix containing Tertullian's Address to Martyrs and the Passion of St. Perpetua. By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 1s. 9d.

## *Translations of Christian Literature (continued).*

### **SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS** *(continued).*

**\*St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Catechetical Oration.**  
By the Ven. J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**\*St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Life of St. Macrina.** By  
W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, B.D. 1s. 9d.

**Gregory Thaumaturgus (Origen the Teacher): the  
Address of Gregory to Origen, with Origen's  
Letter to Gregory.** By W. METCALFE, B.D. 3s. 6d.  
[*Re-issue.*]

**\*The Shepherd of Hermas.** By C. TAYLOR, D.D. 2 vols.  
2s. 6d. each.

**Eusebius: The Proof of the Gospel.** By W. J. FERRAR.  
2 vols. 30s. (*Not sold separately.*)

**Hippolytus: Philosophumena.** By F. LEGGE. 2 vols.  
30s. (*Not sold separately.*)

**The Epistles of St. Ignatius.** By the Ven. J. H.  
SRAWLEY, D.D. 4s.

**\*St. Irenaeus: Against the Heresies.** By F. R. M.  
HITCHCOCK, D.D. 2 vols. 2s. 6d. each.

**Palladius: The Lausiatic History.** By W. K. LOWTHER  
CLARKE, B.D. 5s.

**\*St. Polycarp.** By B. JACKSON. 1s. 9d.

**The Dialogue of Palladius concerning the Life of  
Chrysostom.** By HERBERT MOORE. 8s. 6d.

**Fifty Spiritual Homilies of St. Macarius the Egyptian.**  
By A. J. MASON, D.D. 15s.

### **SERIES II.—LATIN TEXTS.**

**Tertullian's Treatises concerning Prayer, concerning  
Baptism.** By A. SOUTER, D.Litt. 3s.

**Tertullian against Praxeas.** By A. SOUTER, D.Litt.  
5s.



## *Translations of Christian Literature (continued).*

### **SERIES II.—LATIN TEXTS** (*continued*).

**Tertullian concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh.**

By A. SOUTER, D.Litt. 12s. 6d.

**Novatian on the Trinity.** By H. MOORE. 6s.

**St. Augustine: The City of God.** By F. R. M. HITCHCOCK, D.D. 3s. [*Re-issue.*]

**\*St. Cyprian: The Lord's Prayer.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2s.

**Minucius Felix: The Octavius.** By J. H. FREESE. 3s. 6d.

**\*Tertullian: On the Testimony of the Soul and On the Prescription of Heretics.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**\*St. Vincent of Lerins: The Commonitory.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**St. Bernard: Concerning Grace and Free Will.** By WATKIN W. WILLIAMS. 7s. 6d.

**The Life of Otto: Apostle of Pomerania, 1060-1139.** By EBO and HERBORDUS. Translated by CHARLES H. ROBINSON, D.D. 8s. 6d.

**Anskar, the Apostle of the North, 801-865.** By CHARLES H. ROBINSON, D.D. Translated from the *Vita Anskarii* by BISHOP RIMBERT, his fellow-missionary and successor. 4s. [Published by S.P.G.]

**Select Epistles of St. Cyprian treating of the Episcopate.** Edited with Introduction and Notes by T. A. LACEY, M.A. 8s. 6d.

### **SERIES III.—LITURGICAL TEXTS.**

EDITED BY C. L. FELTOE, D.D.

**St. Ambrose: On the Mysteries and on the Sacraments.** By T. THOMPSON, B.D., and J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. 4s. 6d.

**\*The Apostolic Constitution and Cognate Documents, with special reference to their Liturgical elements.** By DE LACY O'LEARY, D.D. 1s. 9d.

## *Translations of Christian Literature (continued).*

### **SERIES III.—LITURGICAL TEXTS** *(continued).*

**The Liturgy of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitution, commonly called the Clementine Liturgy.** By R. H. CRESSWELL. 3s.

**The Pilgrimage of Etheria.** By M. L. McCLURE. 6s.

**Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book.** By the Rt. Rev. J. WORDSWORTH, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**The Swedish Rite.** By E. E. YELVERTON. 8s. 6d.

**Twenty-five Consecration Prayers.** With Notes and Introduction by ARTHUR LINTON. 7s. 6d.

### **SERIES IV.—ORIENTAL TEXTS.**

**The Ethiopic Didascalia.** By J. M. HARDEN, B.D. 9s.

**The Apostolic Preaching of Irenaeus (Armenian).** By J. A. ROBINSON, D.D. 7s. 6d.

### **SERIES V.—LIVES OF THE CELTIC SAINTS.**

EDITED BY ELEANOR HULL.

**St. Malachy of Armagh (St. Bernard).** By H. J. LAWLOR, D.D. 12s.

**The Latin and Irish Lives of Ciaran.** Translated and Annotated by R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, Litt.D., F.S.A. 10s.

**St. Patrick: Life and Works.** By N. J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6s. 6d.

**St. David.** By A. W. WADE-EVANS. 7s. 6d.

### **SERIES VI.—SELECT PASSAGES.**

**Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church.**  
Vol. I.: to A.D. 313. Vol. II.: A.D. 313-A.D. 461.  
Edited by B. J. KIDD, D.D. Vol. I. 7s. 6d. Vol. II. 10s.

### **SERIES VII.**

**Lives of the Serbian Saints.** By VOVESLAV YANICH, D.D., and C. P. HANKEY, M.A. 6s. 6d.

# ***Handbooks of Christian Literature***

**The Letters of St. Augustine.** By the Rev. Canon  
W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. 10s.

**The Early Christian Books. A Short Introduction  
to Christian Literature to the Middle of the Second  
Century.** By the Rev. W. JOHN FERRAR, M.A. 3s. 6d.

**The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture.  
A Study in the Literature of the First Five  
Centuries.** By G. DUNCAN BARRY, B.D. 4s. 6d.

**The Eucharistic Office of the Book of Common Prayer.**  
By the Rev. LESLIE WRIGHT, M.A., B.D. 3s. 6d.

---

## ***Helps for Students of History***

Edited by C. JOHNSON, M.A., H. W. V. TEMPERLEY,  
M.A., and J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

1. **Episcopal Registers of England and Wales.** By  
R. C. FOWLER, B.A., F.S.A. 6d.
2. **Municipal Records.** By F. J. C. HEARNshaw, M.A.,  
LL.D. 1s.
3. **Medieval Reckonings of Time.** By REGINALD L.  
POOLE, LL.D., Litt.D. 6d.
4. **The Public Record Office.** By C. JOHNSON, M.A. 6d.
5. **The Care of Documents.** By C. JOHNSON, M.A. 6d.
6. **The Logic of History.** By C. G. CRUMP. 8d.
7. **Documents in the Public Record Office, Dublin.**  
By R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D. 8d.
8. **The French Wars of Religion.** By ARTHUR A. TILLEY,  
M.A. 6d.

## *Helps for Students of History (continued).*

By Sir A. W. WARD, Litt.D., F.B.A.

9. **The Period of Congresses—I. Introductory.** 8*d*.  
10. **II. Vienna and the Second Peace of Paris.** 1*s*.  
11. **III. Aix-la-Chapelle to Verona.** 1*s*.  
Nos. 9, 10, and 11 in one volume, cloth, 3*s*. 6*d*.  
12. **Securities of Peace: A Retrospect (1848–1914).**  
Paper, 2*s*.; cloth, 3*s*.
- 
13. **The French Renaissance.** By A. A. TILLEY, M.A. 8*d*.  
14. **Hints on the Study of English Economic History.**  
By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., F.B.A., F.S.A. 8*d*.  
15. **Parish History and Records.** By A. HAMILTON  
THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A. 8*d*.  
16. **A Short Introduction to the Study of Colonial  
History.** By A. P. NEWTON, M.A., D.Litt. 6*d*.  
17. **The Wanderings and Homes of Manuscripts.** By  
M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., F.B.A. Paper, 2*s*.; cloth, 3*s*.  
18. **Ecclesiastical Records.** By the Rev. CLAUDE JENKINS,  
M.A., Librarian of Lambeth Palace. 1*s*. 9*d*.  
19. **An Introduction to the History of American  
Diplomacy.** By CARL RUSSELL FISH, Ph.D. 1*s*.  
20. **Hints on Translation from Latin into English.**  
By ALEXANDER SOUTER, D.Litt. 6*d*.  
21. **Hints on the Study of Latin (A.D. 125–750).** By  
ALEXANDER SOUTER, D.Litt. 8*d*.  
22. **Report of the Historical MSS. Commission.** By  
R. A. ROBERTS, F.R.Hist.S. 2*s*. 6*d*.  
23. **A Guide to Franciscan Studies.** By A. G. LITTLE.  
1*s*. 6*d*.  
24. **A Guide to the History of Education.** By JOHN  
WILLIAM ADAMSON. 8*d*.  
25. **Introduction to the Study of Russian History.**  
By W. F. REDDAWAY. 6*d*.



*Helps for Students of History (continued).*

26. **Monuments of English Municipal Life.** By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., F.B.A. 1s.
27. **La Guyenne Pendant la Domination Anglaise, 1152-1453.** Par CHARLES BÉMONT. 1s. 4d.
28. **The Historical Criticism of Documents.** By R. L. MARSHALL, M.A., LL.D. 1s. 3d.
29. **The French Revolution.** By G. P. GOOCH. 8d.
30. **Seals.** By H. S. KINGSFORD. 1s. 3d.
31. **A Student's Guide to the Manuscripts of the British Museum.** By JULIUS P. GILSON, M.A. 1s.
32. **A Short Guide to some Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.** By R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D. 1s. 9d.
- 33-35. **Ireland.** No. 33, 1494-1603; No. 34, 1603-1714; No. 35, 1714-1829. By R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D. Each, 1s. Nos. 33-35 in one volume, 3s. 6d.
36. **Coins and Medals.** By G. F. HILL, M.A., F.B.A. 1s. 6d.
37. **The Latin Orient.** By W. MILLER, M.A. 1s. 6d.
38. **The Turkish Restoration in Greece, 1718-1797.** By WILLIAM MILLER, M.A. 1s. 3d.
39. **Sources for the History of Roman Catholics in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1533-1795.** By JOHN HUNGERFORD POLLEN, S.J. 1s. 3d.
40. **English Time Books.—Vol. I. English Regnal Years and Titles, Hand-lists, Easter Dates, etc.** Compiled by J. E. W. WALLIS, M.A. 4s.
41. **Knights of Malta, 1523-1798.** By R. COHEN. 2s.
42. **Records for the Early History of South Africa.** By C. GRAHAM BOTHA. 1s.
43. **The Western Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library.** By H. H. E. CRASTER, D.Litt. 1s. 3d.
44. **Geographical Factors.** By H. J. FLEURE. 6d.
45. **The Colonial Entry Books. A Brief Guide to the Colonial Records in the Public Record Office before 1696.** By C. S. S. HIGHAM, M.A. 1s. 6d.
46. **The University Library, Cambridge.** By H. GIDNEY ALDIS, M.A. 6d.

## *Helps for Students of History (continued).*

47. **A Students' Guide to the Manuscripts relating to English History in the Seventeenth Century in the Bodleian Library.** By G. DAVIES. 1s.
  48. **History and Ethnology.** By W. R. H. RIVERS, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S. 6d.
  49. **Some Aspects of Boundary Settlement at the Peace Conference.** By ALAN G. OGILVIE, B.Sc. 6d.
  50. **The Mechanical Processes of the Historian.** By CHARLES JOHNSON, M.A., F.S.A. 6d.
  51. **The Sources for the History of the Council in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.** By E. R. ADAIR, M.A. 3s. 6d.
- 

## *The Story of the English Towns*

Popular but Scholarly Histories of English Towns for the general reader, but suitable also for use in schools. With Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. Cloth boards. 4s.

- The City of London.** By P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.S.A.  
**Bath.** By CONSTANCE SPENDER and EDITH THOMPSON.  
**Birmingham.** By J. H. B. MASTERMAN.  
**Canterbury.** By DOROTHY GARDINER. (Cheaper ed. 2s. 6d.)  
**Halifax.** By J. S. FLETCHER.  
**Harrogate and Knaresborough.** By J. S. FLETCHER.  
**Hastings.** By L. F. SALZMAN, M.A., F.S.A.  
**Leeds.** By J. S. FLETCHER.  
**Leicester.** By S. H. SKILLINGTON. 5s.  
**Newcastle-upon-Tyne.** By F. J. C. HEARNshaw, M.A., LL.D.  
**Nottingham.** By E. L. GUILFORD, M.A.  
**Peterborough.** By K. and R. E. ROBERTS.  
**Plymouth.** By A. L. SALMON.  
**Pontefract.** By J. S. FLETCHER.  
**St. Albans.** By W. PAGE, F.S.A.  
**Sheffield.** By J. S. FLETCHER.  
**Westminster.** By H. F. WESTLAKE, M.A., F.S.A.

## ***Studies in Church History***

**The Cathedral Church of Hereford: Its History and Constitution.** By ARTHUR THOMAS BANNISTER, M.A. 7s. 6d.

**The Christian Church in the Epistles of St. Jerome.** By L. HUGHES, M.A., D.D. 4s. 6d.

**The Prelude to the Reformation.** By the Rev. R. S. ARROWSMITH. 8s.

**The Albigensian Heresy.** By H. J. WARNER, B.D. 3s. 6d.

**The Early Franciscans and Jesuits. A Study in Contrasts.** By ARTHUR S. B. FREER, M.A. 6s.

**Some Eighteenth-Century Churchmen: Glimpses of English Church Life in the Eighteenth Century.** By G. LACEY MAY, M.A. With Illustrations. 9s.

**Christian Monasticism in Egypt to the Close of the Fourth Century.** By W. H. MACKEAN, D.D. 8s.

**The Venerable Bede. His Life and Writings.** By the Rt. Rev. G. F. BROWNE, D.D. With Illustrations. 10s.

**The Reformation in Ireland. A Study of Ecclesiastical Legislation.** By H. HOLLOWAY, M.A. 7s. 6d.

**The Emperor Julian. An Essay on His Relations with the Christian Religion.** By EDWARD J. MARTIN, B.D. 3s. 6d.

**The Importance of Women in Anglo-Saxon Times; The Cultus of St. Peter and St. Paul, and other Addresses.** By the Right Rev. G. F. BROWNE, D.D. With two Illustrations. 7s. 6d.

**Essays Liturgical and Historical.** By J. WICKHAM LEGG, D.Litt., F.S.A. 5s.

**French Catholics in the Nineteenth Century.** By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. 5s.

**An Abbot of Vézelay.** By ROSE GRAHAM, F.R.Hist.S. With eight Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

**The Monastic Chronicler and the Early School of St. Albans.** By CLAUDE JENKINS, M.A. 3s. 6d.

## ***Texts for Students***

1. **Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius**, illustrative of Christianity in the First Century. Arranged by H. J. WHITE, D.D. 3*d*.
  2. **Selections from Matthew Paris**. By C. A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit. 9*d*.
  3. **Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis**. By C. A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit. 9*d*.
  4. **Libri Sancti Patricii**. The Latin Writings of St. Patrick, etc. By NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6*d*.
  5. **A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick**. By NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6*d*.
  6. **Selections from the Vulgate**. 9*d*.
  7. **The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome**. 6*d*.
  8. **Select Extracts from Chronicles and Records relating to English Towns in the Middle Ages**. By F. J. C. HEARNshaw, M.A., LL.D. 9*d*.
  9. **The Inscription on the Stele of Méša**. Commonly called the Moabite Stone. Translated by the Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A. 6*d*.
  10. **The Epistles of St. Ignatius**. 1*s*.
  11. **Christian Inscriptions**. By H. P. V. NUNN, M.A. 1*s*.
  12. **Selections from the "Historia Rerum Anglicarum" of William of Newburgh**. 1*s*. 3*d*.
  13. **The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles**. By T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 4*d*. 13A. **An English Translation**. 3*d*.
  14. **The Epistle of Barnabas**. Edited by T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 6*d*. 14A. **An English Translation**. 6*d*.
  15. **The Code of Hammurabi**. By P. HANDCOCK, M.A. 1*s*.
  16. **Selections from the Tell El-Amarna Letters**. By PERCY HANDCOCK, M.A. 4*d*.
  17. **Select Passages Illustrating Commercial and Diplomatic Relations between England and Russia**. By A. WEINER, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. 1*s*. 6*d*.
  18. **The Early History of the Slavonic Settlements in Dalmatia, Croatia and Serbia**. By J. B. BURY. 2*s*.
  19. **Select Extracts Illustrating Florentine Life in the 13th and 14th Centuries**. By E. G. ROPER, B.A. 1*s*.
  20. **Select Extracts Illustrating Florentine Life in the 15th Century**. By ESTHER G. ROPER, B.A. 1*s*.
- Nos. 19 and 20 in one volume, 2*s*. 6*d*.



## *Texts for Students (continued).*

21. **Itinerarium Regis Ricardi.** By M. T. STEAD. 1s. 9d.
22. **The Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.** 6d.
- 22A. **An English Translation of the above.** 6d.
23. **Extracts Illustrating Sports and Pastimes in the Middle Ages.** By E. L. GUILFORD, M.A. 1s. 9d.
24. **Babylonian Flood Stories.** 25. **Babylonian Penitential Psalms.** By P. HANDCOCK, M.A. 6d. each.
26. **The Hymn of Cleanthes.** Translated with Introduction and Notes by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. 6d.
27. **The Foundations of Modern Ireland.** The Civil Policy of Henry VIII. and the Reformation. By CONSTANTIA MAXWELL, M.A. 1s. 6d.
28. **Selections from the Qur'án.** Arranged by H. U. WEITBRECHT STANTON, M.D., D.D. 1s.
29. **The Tome of Pope Leo the Great.** Latin Text with Translation, Introduction, and Notes, by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. 1s. ; duxeen boards, 1s. 6d.
30. **The Book of Amos.** Hebrew Text edited by THEODORE H. ROBINSON, M.A., D.D. 2s. 6d.
31. **Sukkah.** (A Critical Hebrew Text.) By A. W. GREENUP, D.D. 2s. 6d.
32. **Readings from the Apocrypha.** Selected and Annotated by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. 1s. ; cloth, 1s. 6d.
33. **English Social Life in the Eighteenth Century.**  
& Illustrated from Contemporary Sources. By M. D.  
34. GEORGE. Each 1s. 6d. In one vol. cloth, 3s. 6d.
35. **Texts Illustrating Ancient Ruler-Worship.** Edited by C. LATTEY, S.J., M.A. 6d.
- 35A. **An English Translation of the above.** 6d.
36. **Select Passages Illustrative of Neoplatonism.** Greek edition. Edited by E. R. DODDS, B.A. 4s. 6d.
37. **Traders in East and West.** Some Aspects of Trade in the 17th and 18th Centuries. By FLORENCE L. BOWMAN and ESTHER G. ROPER. 2s.
38. **Travellers and Travelling in the Middle Ages.** By E. L. GUILFORD, M.A. 2s.

# ***Pioneers of Progress***

**MEN OF SCIENCE :** Edited by S. CHAPMAN, M.A., D.Sc.  
With Portrait. Paper cover, 1s. ; cloth, 2s.

**Galileo.** By W. W. BRYANT, F.R.A.S.

**Michael Faraday.** By J. A. CROWTHER, D.Sc.

**Alfred Russel Wallace.** By L. T. HOGBEN, B.A., B.Sc.

**Joseph Priestley.** By D. H. PEACOCK, B.A., M.Sc., F.I.C.

**Joseph Dalton Hooker.** By F. O. BOWER, Sc.D., F.R.S.

**Herschel.** By HECTOR MACPHERSON, M.A., F.R.A.S.,  
F.R.S.E.

**Archimedes.** By Sir THOMAS L. HEATH, K.C.B., F.R.S.

**The Copernicus of Antiquity (Aristarchus of Samos).**  
By Sir THOMAS L. HEATH, K.C.B., F.R.S.

**John Dalton.** By L. J. NEVILLE-POLLEY, B.Sc.

**Kepler.** By WALTER W. BRYANT, F.R.A.S.

**Richard Arkwright.** By J. H. CRABTREE. (Duxeen, 2s.)

---

**EMPIRE BUILDERS :** Edited by W. BASIL WORSFOLD,  
M.A. With Portrait. Paper cover, 1s. ; cloth, 2s.

**Sir Francis Drake.** By WALTER J. HARTE, M.A.

**Sir Robert Sandeman.** By A. L. P. TUCKER, C.I.E.

**Mungo Park.** By W. H. HEWITT, B.A., B.Sc. (Duxeen,  
2s. 6d.)

**Richard Hakluyt.** By FOSTER WATSON, D.Litt. (Duxeen,  
2s. 6d.)

---

**WOMEN :** Edited by ETHEL M. BARTON.

With Illustrations. Paper cover, 2s. ; cloth, 3s.

**Florence Nightingale.** By E. F. HALL.

**Dorothea Beale.** By ELIZABETH H. SHILLITO, B.A.

**Elsie Inglis.** By EVA SHAW McLAREN.

---

**Josephine Butler, and her work for Social Purity.**  
By L. HAY COOPER. With Two Portraits. Cloth. 5s.

[1.8.25.]